

of the present attendance of Senators, a conference report dealing with any other legislative matter.

Mr. BILBO. I would not request that the conference report be considered at this time if it were not for the fact that the bill has been pending since November 1945 and also in view of the following peculiar situation: The Senate passed the bill without any objection. It went to the House of Representatives, and the House added three amendments. In the conference, the conferees on the part of the House receded from all the amendments made by the House of Representatives, and consequently the conference report merely provides for the bill which the Senate passed. No objection could be made by any Senator, because the bill as passed by the Senate has not been changed.

Mr. WHITE. Accepting the Senator's assurance that the bill is now in the precise form in which it was when it was passed by the Senate, I shall voice no objection.

Mr. BILBO. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report.

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns or takes a recess today, it may be understood that I shall have the floor when the Senate reconvenes at 12 o'clock on Monday. I have not finished my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, under the previous order of the Senate, I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, to Monday, April 22, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

POSTMASTERS

LOUISIANA

Geneva S. Hoffpauir, Estherwood.
Alice B. Meador, Greenwell Springs.
Anna M. Broussard, Jefferson Island.
Guy W. Harkness, Sibley.

MINNESOTA

Ethel H. Poynter, Erhard.
Clifford Hitterdal, Hitterdal.

NEBRASKA

Lois Hopkins, Venango.

WISCONSIN

Arthur H. Schrank, Dancy.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God, our Father, in the valley of the shadow with death tracking us and ours, we come in the afterglow of Easter in the glorious certainty that life is ever lord of death: that we share the victory of that One who wrestled with death in a garden where tyranny had sealed a tomb, and who came forth from the struggle with the keys of hell and death swinging from His girdle. Thou hast placed us in a world whose face is as ugly as sin and as lovely as a sunset, as cruel as a stormy sea and as tender as a mother's love, a world of violets and vipers, of slime and stars, of laughter and tears, but a world where the horror of a malefactor's cross has been made to flame with the glory of an empty tomb. Sharing the risen life, may our words and deeds proclaim our creed: That life is stronger than death, that love is stronger than hate, that truth is stronger than error, and that always behind death's husks tremble the seeds of birth. In all the contradictions and confusions of these days, help us to hold that faith, and to hold it fast, in the sure confidence that the third day comes. In the name of the risen Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, April 19, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1907) to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF UNRRA— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the sixth report to Congress on UNRRA operations

for the quarter ending December 31, 1945.

During this quarter, while UNRRA's shipments reached unprecedented figures, recipient countries experienced unprecedented needs. Crop failures resulted in the continuance of near-famine conditions. The hardships of winter were imminent.

At year's end, moreover, critical shortages (notably of wheat, fats, meat for Europe, and of rice for China) threatened execution of even the limited relief program that had been planned. For millions survival was, and still is, the issue, and for UNRRA the challenge to be met. World recovery still remains a formidable task.

Only concerted action by the United Nations (and, primarily, of the producing countries) can, even at this date, avert the prolongation of emergency conditions throughout the world. Now, more than ever, intensified efforts to match need with supply, are required of us. We must not fail—for our continued participation in UNRRA marks the fulfillment of a pledge and the discharge of a debt to those who, beyond the common sacrifice of life and material resources, endured the devastation and brutalities that we were spared. Conscience alone demands that we meet the full measure of our obligation.

But prudence and self-interest no less dictate our policy. Neither peace nor prosperity can be assured to us while famine, disease, and destitution deprive others of the means to live, let alone to prosper. Relief and rehabilitation are paramount necessities for that world recovery which is a primary objective of our national policy. They provide the best insurance against social chaos and moral disintegration and the surest guaranty for the growth of democratic modes of thought and action. The emergency, which UNRRA was designed to meet, continues. The months immediately ahead are critical.

While ours is the largest contribution to UNRRA's funds, it is matched by like, proportionate contributions of 30 other nations. This gives significance to UNRRA altogether beyond the relief that it provides. In UNRRA the United Nations have created the first international operating agency through which to test and to perfect our powers of cooperation. Such powers are not inborn. They are cultivated, by constant exercise and the progressive enlargement of mutual experience. In UNRRA a precedent has been created that may prove a landmark in our progress toward solidarity and common action by the nations of the world.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 22, 1946.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions and memorial, which were referred as indicated:

Petitions of several citizens of the United States praying for the continuation of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Memorials of several citizens of the State of California, remonstrating against the continuation of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 2023) to provide emergency relief for victims of the seismic waves which struck the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1314. A bill for the relief of Frederic P. L. Mills; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1230).

By Mr. HUFFMAN, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1132. A bill for the relief of Aeronautical Training Center, Inc.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1231);

S. 1444. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reta H. Hardin and others; with amendments (Rept. No. 1232); and

H. R. 2091. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Bennett; with amendments (Rept. No. 1233).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 933. A bill for the relief of the estate of Sybel Spence; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1234).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3094. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corp. against the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1235).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 5059. A bill to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1229).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 2093. A bill for the relief of Claude J. Squires; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 2094. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Eddyville, Iowa; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 2095. A bill authorizing issuance of a patent in fee to John E. Schroeder;

S. 2096. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Little Light;

S. 2097. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Esther Peon Frost; and

S. 2098. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gideon Peon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

S. 2099. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept gifts, devises, and bequests in behalf of the general post fund for the use of veterans and for the sale and conveyance of any such property under certain circumstances and the covering of the proceeds thereof into the post fund, and for other purposes; and

S. 2100. A bill to remove the limitations on the amount of death compensation or pension payable to widows and children of certain deceased veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2101. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, to permit the shipment of relief supplies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BRIDGES introduced Senate bill 2102, to promote the common defense of the United States of America by coordinating the departments and agencies of the Government relating to the common defense, to establish a Department of Air, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ATTACKS ON AMERICAN PLANES BY RUSSIAN PLANES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on March 22, 1945, I addressed a communication to the Secretary of War making inquiry about American planes being forced to land by Russian planes. I told the Secretary of War of an instance that occurred on November 28, 1945, when a United States Army air transport, the C-47 was forced to land over Gottingen by a Russian fighting plane. The Secretary replied that he would investigate this and other similar incidents and report. That investigation is now in progress.

I was profoundly shocked to learn this morning that, as I understand, a C-47 American transport plane on a test flight flying to Vienna within a 10-mile radius around Vienna where it was understood it was permissible for Americans to fly was attacked by four Russian fighter planes. They not only attacked the American plane, but they fired 37 millimeter cannon at the American plane and forced the American plane to land at a place I understand to be called Tulln. I understand that the planes that attacked were probably P-39's which were American-built planes constructed under American Government contracts and sent to Russia under lend-lease. This is a fine return of reverse lend-lease. So it seems that our own planes sent to Russia under lend-lease attacked the American plane and forced it down at an airport near Vienna. The American plane was commanded by Capt. James C. Baxter. In general that is all the news that has come through up to this moment.

I desire to say, Mr. President, that these incidents occurring one after another have got to stop, and it is up to the heads of the American Government to take the necessary action that they be stopped. This irresponsible attacking by the Russians of American boys and American planes is absolutely unwarranted, and I want to know what is going to be done about it, and what action the United States Government is taking to

prevent other occurrences of this kind. This thing simply cannot keep on.

I refer to this incident at this time because of my previous request for an investigation of these incidents. The investigation as I understand is now in progress, and I propose to call this one officially to the attention of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of State, and the President of the United States and demand positive, forceful action on their part.

CONGRESS AND PRICE CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the New York Times for Friday, April 19, there appeared an editorial entitled "Congress and Price Control." The editorial very forcibly and intelligently gives us the facts relative to the position the membership of the House of Representatives took in the votes upon the amendments which were made, and also the vote on the bill as it passed the House. The editorial is most timely, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONGRESS AND PRICE CONTROL

It would be naive to suppose that the amendments piled on so lavishly by the House of Representatives in extending price control were all well considered. But most of them, if not right in detail, were right in principle. Price control is at best a secondary and transitional weapon against inflation. It has in many cases already outlived its usefulness. It deals with the symptoms and consequences of inflation, not with its causes.

Those who have been in direct control of OPA have failed to recognize this fact. They have talked and acted as if price control were the central or sole method of combatting inflation. They have failed to recognize its obvious effects in intensifying or prolonging shortages. They have failed to see any danger to a free economy in placing the fate of every industry and firm at the mercy of administrative decision.

They failed utterly to acknowledge that the whole problem they had to solve changed completely last August, when Japan capitulated. It was then no longer necessary to restrict and discourage civilian production, but, on the contrary, to speed as rapidly as possible a reconversion to civilian output. But the official price controllers continued to put more emphasis on prices than on production. They failed to recognize that the time had come to taper off price control in an orderly manner. They professed, it is true, not to wish to continue price control "a day longer than was necessary." They promised to remove controls "as soon as supply comes into balance with demand." But they forgot that supply comes into balance with demand only at a price, and that it was within the power of OPA under this formula to perpetuate the supposed need for itself.

They failed, in short, to give Congress any clear standards for decontrol. On the contrary, the President and Mr. Bowles asked for the extension of OPA for another year without amendment. When it became clear that Congress could not in peacetime reasonably be expected to give the Executive the same blanket powers over prices and wages that were embodied in the wartime stabilization acts, this was changed to a request to extend price control without crippling amendments. But so far as OPA was

concerned this second phrase seemed to mean the same as the first; for that agency objected to every amendment proposed to limit or taper off its purely discretionary powers.

Congress was therefore compelled to draft tapering-off amendments without guidance from OPA. It could hardly be expected to do a perfect job. Indeed, in this particular task, it may be doubted whether any such thing as a perfect job is even theoretically conceivable. But if some of the House's main amendments are dubious in detail, they are nonetheless right in principle. There is a psychological advantage, for example, in extending OPA for only 9 months instead of for another full year. It puts OPA more clearly on notice that it cannot expect an indefinite series of annual renewals and that it had better prepare this time for its own liquidation.

The House was right again in seeking to taper off the subsidy program, beginning immediately. The method it proposes may not be the best one possible; but the House was right in sensing the dangerous and inflationary nature of subsidies, which OPA authorities have been expanding instead of contracting. The House may not have the perfect formula, once more, in requiring OPA to lift price ceilings from a commodity when its annual production rate equals that from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941. But some definite, reasonably attainable standard for releasing controls automatically from one commodity after another had to be found; experience showed that Congress could not rely on mere administrative discretion. It is not easy to see, finally, how the amendment that OPA must price goods to yield cost plus a reasonable profit will work out; but the OPA's own formula has been in many cases so inflexible and indifferent to producers' problems that some congressional compulsion on OPA to act more liberally was thought necessary.

The Senate, let us hope, will consider these problems more carefully, to see whether better criteria for liberalization and termination of price control can be evolved. But when Congress does this, it must remember that it is more necessary than ever to deal with the real causes of inflation. Its first task in that direction must be to curb expenditures, to bring deficit financing to an end, and to stop the further increase of money and bank credit.

TRIBUTE TO TEXAS SERVICEMEN BY SENATOR CONNALLY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator CONNALLY before the Texas A. and M. Club in Washington on San Jacinto Day, April 21, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Zionist movement, delivered by him at the Collingwood Avenue Temple, Toledo, Ohio, April 14, 1946, before the Toledo (Ohio) Zionist district, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "No Action Yet on Presidential Succession," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of April 18, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAUPERIZING THE DISABLED WAR VETERAN—EDITORIAL FROM HEARST NEWS-PAPERS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial en-

titled "Pauperizing the Disabled War Veteran," from the Hearst newspapers of recent date, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FOOD CRISIS—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Famine Truman Helped Make," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 20, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATTITUDE OF 31 GOVERNORS ON BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this morning the various newspapers of the country carried a news statement to the effect that 31 governors of States of the Union have urged that the 1947 Budget be balanced. They represent a combination of governors from various sections of the United States, both Democrats and Republicans. It is an excellent statement and shows a widespread interest in putting the financial affairs of the country in proper shape. The subject is approached in a very nonpartisan way, and the statement indicates that a great majority of the governors of the sovereign States of the Union favor balancing the Budget.

I ask that as a part of my remarks there be included an article from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Thirty-one Governors Urge Balanced '46-'47 Budget—Republicans and Democrats Ask Change in Fiscal Policy Starting July 1."

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 22, 1946]

THIRTY-ONE GOVERNORS URGE BALANCED '46-'47 BUDGET—REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS ASK CHANGE IN FISCAL POLICY STARTING JULY 1

Eighteen Republican and thirteen Democratic governors issued statements last night calling for a balanced Federal Budget, beginning July 1. The statements generally urged the people "to support their Congressmen in the achievement of this important result," and stressed the "major threats to the Nation's welfare" from "further deficit spending and continued borrowing."

Twenty governors, nine of them Democrats, released separate but identical statements at their capitals pointing out that "the alarming growth of inflationary trends is increasingly aggravated by unsound Federal fiscal practices," and that "the further use of such practices is a constant menace to the constitutional position of our State and local governments, and a threat to their fiscal solvency."

Eleven other governors, including four Democrats, issued individually phrased statements for the most part expanding upon the necessity of a balanced Federal Budget during the coming fiscal year.

Administration spokesmen declined to comment last night on the governors' action, but recalled that President Truman's latest report on the Nation's economic condition stated that it was the administration's aim to balance the 1947 Budget.

The coordinated gubernatorial statements followed requests from many of the Nation's State taxpayers' associations "urging the governors of their various States to endorse the principle of a balanced Federal Budget," it was explained last night in Springfield, Ill., by Thomas E. Fiske, executive secretary of the Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois.

Mr. Fiske spoke on behalf of many of the 36 State taxpayers' associations throughout the country. These are not organized na-

tionally but have an informal national coordinating committee.

Among the governors not joining in last night's simultaneous release were Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, who was not available for comment at Pawling, N. Y., where he passed Easter Sunday, and Gov. Earl Warren, Republican, of California.

The country-wide gubernatorial action complements a bipartisan move of a similar nature made on March 3 by 16 leading Democratic and Republican Members of Congress. They issued through Senators HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, and STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, a statement which called for immediate measures "to put the United States on a sound fiscal basis" and expressed the opinion that the Federal Budget for the coming fiscal year could and should be balanced.

TEXT OF STATEMENT

The text of the identical statement issued by the 20 governors follows:

"As Governor of the State of _____, I endorse the principle that a balanced Federal Budget is essential to national solvency. I am convinced:

"That further deficit spending and continued borrowing are major threats to the Nation's welfare;

"That the alarming growth of inflationary trends is increasingly aggravated by unsound Federal fiscal practices;

"That the further use of such practices is a constant menace to the constitutional position of our State and local governments, and a threat to their fiscal solvency; and

"That if these trends and practices continue, they will lead inevitably to increased costs, increased taxes; and thus affect adversely every individual in this country.

"I, therefore, sincerely hope that Congress will provide a balanced Federal budget beginning July 1, 1946, and I urge the people of this State to support their Congressmen in the achievement of this important result."

Signers of the foregoing statement were Govs. Chauncey Sparks, Alabama; Ben T. Laney, Arkansas; Herbert R. O'Connor, Maryland; Thomas L. Bailey, Mississippi; Frank J. Lausche, Ohio; Ransome J. Williams, South Carolina; Jim Nace McCord, Tennessee; Coke R. Stevenson, Texas; and William M. Tuck, Virginia, all Democrats.

Also Govs. John C. Vivian, Colorado; Dwight H. Green, Illinois; Ralph F. Gates, Indiana; Robert D. Blue, Iowa; Horace A. Eldredge, Maine; Sam C. Ford, Montana; Dwight Griswold, Nebraska; Charles M. Dale, New Hampshire; Fred G. Aandahl, North Dakota; M. Q. Sharpe, South Dakota; and Mortimer R. Proctor, Vermont, all Republicans.

HUNT ISSUES OWN STATEMENT

In one of the 11 individually phrased statements Gov. Lester C. Hunt, Democrat, of Wyoming, spoke in greater detail of the national-debt problem.

"During the depression and war years," he said, "there was no alternative—the national debt had to be increased. Now, with a complete change in the situation and peace and plenty reigning throughout the land, a determined, positive stand must be taken by the National Government and all political subdivisions, not only to balance the Budget but to reduce the indebtedness. This can be accomplished only while we are enjoying prosperity.

"I am convinced that since, during the time the national debt has increased, the State governments have practically liquidated all indebtedness and built up sizable balances, they should assume a greater portion of the Nation's financial responsibility and, in so doing, also retrieve some surrendered State rights."

Gov. Walter E. Edge, Republican, of New Jersey, said in an individual statement that, "any program in the Congress to reduce the present tremendous expenditures and de-

crease the amount of money borrowed by the Federal Government is certain to reflect in the general prosperity of the Nation. Now that the war is over, every effort should be made by responsible leaders in Congress to eliminate excessive expenditures and compel the Federal Government to live within its income as we do here in New Jersey."

SNELL WARNS OF SLASHING

Gov. Earl Snell, Republican, of Oregon, stated that in desiring a balanced Budget at the earliest possible date he did not have in mind "an ill-considered program of slashing, which would jeopardize essential services, needed projects, and legitimate obligations." He stressed rather the necessity for "the elimination of needless activities and a general program of economy."

"A material reduction in the number of Federal employees" was called for by Gov. Simeon S. Willis, Republican, of Kentucky, who said that a "policy of retrenchment in Federal expenditures should be relentlessly pursued."

Gov. Vail Pittman, Democrat, of Nevada, said that toward the goal of balancing the Federal Budget at the earliest possible time consistent with sound economic practice he favored "the elimination of unnecessary and duplicating Government bureaus and agencies and the paring of expenditures that are not essential to the safe and efficient conduct of Government."

Others issuing individual statements were Govs. Raymond E. Baldwin, Republican, Connecticut; Walter W. Bacon, Republican, Delaware; Edward J. Thye, Republican, Minnesota; R. Gregg Cherry, Democrat, North Carolina; Edward Martin, Republican, Pennsylvania; and Herbert B. Maw, Democrat, Utah.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan, and I yield the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	McMahon
Austin	Gossett	Maybank
Ball	Green	Millikin
Bankhead	Gulley	Mitchell
Barkley	Gurney	Morse
Bilbo	Hart	Murdock
Brewster	Hatch	Murray
Bridges	Hayden	Myers
Brooks	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Buck	Hill	Reed
Bushfield	Huffman	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Carville	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Connally	Knowland	Shipstead
Cordon	La Follette	Smith
Donnell	Langer	Taft
Downey	Lucas	Taylor
Eastland	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McFarland	Tydings
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg

Wagner
Wheeler
Wherry

White
Willey
Willis

Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is absent on official business in connection with his duties as chairman of the Special Committee for Investigation of the National Defense Program.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Banking and Currency Committee which has had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 138 involving the so-called British loan legislation. I had not wished to inject myself into the debate until members of the committee, particularly on my side of the aisle, had spoken. But unless I am to be silent on the subject I must speak today, because I am leaving for Paris tomorrow morning at the request of the Secretary of State in connection with the approaching critical meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, where a basis for treaties of peace with ex-enemy powers will be sought. I do not feel that I am entitled to be silent. Candor, therefore, compels this statement today. For the sake of continuity, Mr. President, I shall appreciate it if I may be permitted to make my preliminary statement without interruption.

Mr. President, this British loan has perplexed me more than any other problem in all my 18 Senate years. I have refrained from taking my position on it until I could exhaust every available source of information and advice. It is a subject which defies any certainty of conclusion. To pass the joint resolution is a gigantic speculation; not to pass the joint resolution may be an even greater speculation. The latter is no surer than the former in its promise of vindicated wisdom. It is probably less

sure. It is a question which chance is the better one for the United States to take for the sake of American welfare in a peaceful, stabilized world.

I find no comfort, unfortunately, in the usual rule of prudence which says, "When in doubt don't." Don't what? Make the loan or deny the loan? The trouble is that the "doubts" and the "don'ts" are interchangeable. I can understand how men of conscience can, as they have, come to widely differing conclusions because there are so many imponderables involved. This is not a problem in exact mathematics where 2 and 2 make 4. There are no standard blueprints upon which we can pattern this postwar decision. This is not a transaction which can be rationalized, for example, upon some such simple question as "Will the debt be paid?" There is so much more involved. This is a problem involving all the economic forces in the complex economic and social relations of a world which by trial and error must struggle back to stability and forward to peace.

In my opinion, Mr. President, whether we like it or not, destiny is in these scales today. This is not a question whether we owe England the further cooperation of more aid on top of all the other vast contributions which we have poured into our common crucible of war. No one can deny that we have been utterly prodigal in men and money in the achievement of victory against aggression—just as no one can deny that we have been utterly lucky that not one single bomb fell on the continental United States, while 4,000,000 houses were damaged or destroyed in Britain. Any comparisons upon either score are odious. Furthermore, they are beside the point.

This is solely a question, Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, whether, all things considered, this postwar loan should be made by us as a matter of intelligent American self-interest. It is solely a question whether the passage of this joint resolution is reasonably calculated to be of adequately compensatory advantage to the people of the United States. It is solely a question of whether the defeat of the joint resolution will be calculated to precipitate conditions which could harm the welfare of our own country and our own citizens. The test is right here at home.

It is on this basis, Mr. President, that I have struck my balance. It is on this basis that I have come to the reluctant but firm conviction for myself that the joint resolution should pass for the sake of America.

I shall briefly summarize my reasons, not in a maze of figures which can be made to prove or disprove almost anything, but in what I believe to be the preponderant logic in respect to the realities of today and tomorrow. This is not a matter of philanthropy. This is a matter of judgment—whether America, now the greatest creditor country on the globe, can best protect her own essential and inescapable position by these means; whether for our own sakes we must not accept the economic as well as the moral leadership in a wandering world which

must be stabilized just as necessarily for us as for others.

If we do not lead, Mr. President, some other great and powerful nation will capitalize our failure, and we shall pay the price of our default. We shall not stand still. We shall either go forward or backward. I want America to cling to leadership. I am unwilling to surrender leadership to any power which would take it from us.

There are things about this joint resolution I do not like. There are things I would have done differently. I think it was a mistake not to have consulted Congress when the contract was in the making instead of waiting to confront us with a finished product which is far from satisfactory in many serious details.

I should like to interpolate at this point with reference to my colloquy with the distinguished majority leader in last week's debate. He expressed the view that other foreign loans will be made through the Export-Import Bank. I stated then that the Export-Import Bank was organized solely for the purpose of making commercial loans, and not for the purpose of making general foreign loans of this character; and that the latter require consultation at a higher policy level. In my view this particularly includes congressional consultations. The Secretary of State is an ex officio director of the Export-Import Bank. If the loaning facilities of the Export-Import Bank are to be enlarged by further legislation I respectfully suggest that the Senate consider a further amendment adding—perhaps temporarily—representatives of the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees to the Board of the Export-Import Bank as ex officio members.

As I was saying, I think it was a mistake not to have consulted Congress in advance with respect to the details of this contract which we are now asked to underwrite. But I do not rest my judgment, Mr. President, upon details, bad or good. I rest it on the overriding importance of the concept as a whole.

Let me give the Senators this analogy: One can tear across a few pages in a book with one thumb and finger with simple ease; but one cannot tear across the volume as a whole, with both hands, no matter how hard he may try. Thus we may demolish separate arguments in behalf of one section or another of the joint resolution, taken by themselves; but in my humble but convinced opinion, we cannot demolish the sum total of the challenge, which is a challenge to our own American self-interest.

I was particularly struck, Mr. President, with a few statesmanlike sentences from the supporting testimony of Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, when he appeared before the Senate committee to endorse this measure. He said:

The true significance of the British loan agreement to the American worker, the American businessman, and the American farmer is not in the direct effect of the American dollar provided to an Allied Nation in time of the most critical need. To meet that need is important. But the real significance of this loan to us is in the alternatives we must realistically face. If we choose not to aid Britain now, the whole

structure—monetary, economic, and political—of healthy international cooperation will inevitably begin to crumble.

Perhaps I shall oversimplify the question, but I shall at least try to define it in what I believe to be the paramount objectives which in my view outweigh the incidental details, however dubious some of those details may seem to be. Therefore, I lay my foundation upon the following statement:

While America's greatest market will always be the home market, the richest in the world, and while it will always be colossal folly to neglect or compromise the home market in pursuit of sales abroad, the inevitable fact remains that sooner or later America must maintain and develop supplemental trade all around this globe if we are to assure steady total national income at the level required for even an approximation of full employment, general prosperity, and national solvency. We may need no foreign customers at the moment because of the pent-up consumer demand now pressuring our insufficient stocks. Quite the contrary at the moment. But this legislative problem demands of us a long-range view. Inevitably the day of need will come.

America has the greatest industrial capacity of any nation in the world. In 1946, for example, we possess 60 percent of the world's factory output. One out of five workers in my own State of Michigan normally depends upon export orders for his job. We have had, and we shall have again, great surpluses in both industry and agriculture. In a word, we have a tremendous long-range stake in exports and in world trade as a matter of intelligent self-interest. We have a tremendous stake in what kind of a pattern world trade hereafter shall pursue, as a matter of intelligent self-interest. This must be of particular concern to those of us who are deeply wedded to the pattern of full production, free enterprise, and free competition, because the very character of our own economy may be involved in what we here do, as I shall indicate a little later.

In my opinion, this measure may prove to be a decisive factor in determining whether we are to live in a world of decent commercial opportunity or whether we are to attempt survival in a world of bitter economic strife and in a world of government cartels which might make any sort of peace impossible.

Peace is indivisible. I submit that the right answer is of just as great importance to us as it is to Britain; aye, of greater importance, because of our greater resources and our greater stake in destiny.

I also very earnestly submit, Mr. President, that we cannot hope to approach this decision in a safe mood, for our own sakes, unless we frankly recognize, first, that this proposal is not a one-way street; and, second, that these are not the pre-Pearl Harbor days, which are gone forever.

Let us look at the available alternatives. Under the stress of world depression and world war, Britain established a system of blocked trading in the so-called sterling area which accounted for nearly one-half of the world's ordinary imports

and exports, and almost half of the ordinary import and export trade of our own country. Our trade was, and is, and will be substantially handicapped, if not actually excluded, from most of these vital markets. All these areas—not merely Britain alone—are involved in our considerations. This is no mean stake.

Roughly, the area includes all British Commonwealth and Empire countries, except Newfoundland and Canada, plus Egypt, Iraq, and Iceland, and, if the system persists, many nations with which the United Kingdom has payment agreements, such as Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and Turkey.

The fundamental American purpose in this loan is to provide Britain with about 70 percent of the foreign exchange she will require in a transitional period of perhaps 5 years, the balance coming from other available sources—to do what? To permit her to abandon these restrictive controls. The controls, of course, involve not only direct, but also indirect and triangular trade. I quote two or three sentences from the committee report at this point:

In the years immediately before the war the English people imported two-thirds of their food and the bulk of every important raw material except coal. One-sixth of the British national income was spent to buy foreign goods. Britain alone took almost 20 percent of the total exports of the other countries of the world. She was the most important customer of a score of countries, including the United States.

Britain agrees to abolish immediately any exchange controls affecting United States products imported into the United Kingdom, or affecting sterling balances of United States nationals arising out of current transactions; to eliminate within 1 year, with specified exceptions, all restrictions on payments and transfers for current transactions; to eliminate not later than December 31, 1946, discrimination against the United States in any quantitative import restrictions; to make agreements with the countries concerned for an early settlement covering blocked sterling balances; to give no other creditor better terms than these; and to join with the United States in a program for the elimination or modification of discriminatory trade barriers, including Empire tariff preferences.

In assessing the importances of these objectives, Mr. President—and these objectives underline the fact that this arrangement cannot possibly be a precedent for any other foreign loans, because they are so utterly individualistic in their character—let it be noted that the American dollar and the British pound are the two key currencies of the world, accounting for perhaps two-thirds of the world's business. Therefore, in stabilizing dollar-pound relationships, we are moving in an orbit infinitely larger, in influence and results, than the initial bilateral nature of the loan might misleadingly suggest.

Again I wish to quote a few sentences from the committee report:

If their minimum import needs—

Referring to the British—

cannot be financed in a convertible currency from outside the sterling area, they must devise and impose trade and exchange controls of unprecedented severity. Such controls would stifle the trade of every important country which exports to Britain and the sterling area. It would involve an economic war between the sterling and the dollar blocs which would plunge the entire world into a vicious spiral of declining trade, restrictions, and counter-restrictions.

The financial agreement is designed to make it possible for the United Kingdom to reject this alternative, and it contains provisions requiring that the British do in fact reject it.

Mr. President, I subscribe wholeheartedly to the sentiment thus asserted in the committee report.

It may be said that all these benefits may not accrue because some of them are contingent. That is, unfortunately, true. But neither we nor they would bind ourselves against whatever recourse sheer self-preservation might ultimately require.

So we simply come back to the initial question: Is the chance worth while? That immediately poses the other question, What is the alternative?

Mr. President, the alternative, it seems to me, is quite clear. We would be thrust into a world of bilateral barter, which once had great attraction, but which in this new age is intimately linked with state regimentations which are the exact antithesis of every aspiration we Americans hold dear. In a desperate battle for economic survival and in the face of political resistance to the new and grim austerities which the hard-ridden British people would confront at home, Britain would be forced to tighten and expand the various trade controls which already seriously hamstring and threaten American foreign trade in many parts of the world.

Indeed, there are those in high places in Britain who themselves oppose this loan because they believe they can do better for their country by thus expanding their own exclusive imperial spheres.

Where does all this lead, Mr. President? It is undoubtedly inevitable that Russia will continue to conduct her foreign commerce exclusively upon a state-trading basis. I do not complain; I simply state the fact. I call attention also to the comment of Mr. Constantine Brown in the Washington Star upon this particular phase:

Because of the totalitarian form of government adopted by eastern and southeastern Europe, free enterprise exists in name alone. The reciprocal agreements signed between the puppet premiers and the U. S. S. R. are complex, but a careful analysis shows that whatever business they may wish to transact with foreign nations must be done through Moscow.

Totalitarian or parliamentary governments have a great advantage over democracies in such trade wars because they can take instant action. If Britain is forced to join this trend—forced as a matter of sheer, stark self-preservation—if she is forced to join this trend, either by us or by her own minorities, we may confront a dominating surge of bloc arrangements and trade alliances, with all of their defensive and restrictive

devices, which could easily force us into kindred action in reciprocal self-defense, if we wished to maintain any part of our world trade at all. It would be economic politics in the pattern of power politics. It is probable that this, in turn, could force us, like the others, into a defensive state monopoly in charge of foreign trade, and thus renew and magnify the systems of business dictation against which we are currently in such violent rebellion. We might be driven toward more and more control of our entire economy.

Mr. President, I have no fear that we should not be able to hold our own in such a battle if we be willing to do what it would take to win. We would be under something of a competitive handicap because our exports are habitually greater than our imports, and our bargaining power suffers in proportion. Furthermore, our costs of production will also be dangerously higher in a competitive field. But I certainly would not be understood as even remotely suggesting that we would be outdone if, I repeat, we did what it takes to win. But I repeat that there is a better way for us and for the world, and the pending joint resolution contemplates that better way, if it can be made to work.

A recent McGraw-Hill editorial has summed up the situation better than I could hope to do:

In the years immediately ahead it is certain that from two-thirds to three-quarters of all international trade will be transacted either in pounds or dollars. If both circuits are linked in a determined effort to restore competitive world markets, to which buyers and sellers alike have access without discrimination, that will be the dominant system of foreign trade. If the sterling group with its satellites organizes a closed grid, our exclusive effort cannot preserve the trade pattern that we believe offers most to us and to the world.

No one can accurately measure the costs to the United States of refusing the loan and accepting the consequences. But unquestionably they would dwarf to insignificance the sum risked in the proposed credit. We would lose through the shrinkage of our trade, through the wrench of violent readjustments in our production patterns, and eventually through the curtailment of our over-all output below what it would be under an open, rather than a closed, system. We would lose heavily in economic liberty under a procedure that can be followed with success only by a close regimentation of production as well as trade.

At this point I also wish to quote, Mr. President, from the statement of the highly able Chairman of the Board of Governors of our own Federal Reserve System, Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, who left this very profound and important admonition with our committee when he testified:

Without effective British participation, which is possible only if we lend our aid, the Bretton Woods institutions cannot fulfill the hopes which we have placed in them. Without the fulfillment of these hopes for a stable economic order in the world, there is little prospect of success for the United Nations organization in its search for political stability and security. Without economic or political stability we can expect only a continued drift of world affairs toward the catastrophe of a third world war.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there is a tendency in some quarters to so concentrate on details in respect to this joint resolution that the larger, total concept is obscured—like those who are so close to the trees that they do not see the forest. It is for this reason that I have purposely concentrated on the forest. Furthermore, the details have been and will be amply debated by others. It is right that they should have been, and they should be fully, totally, and ruthlessly explored. I do not for an instant depreciate the importance of these details. I repeat that these are details which I do not like. But I repeat also that I find a final balance favorable to the joint resolution in terms of intelligent American self-interest which ought to be our dominating consideration. I think we have more to gain than to lose by taking whatever chance is involved. It is the lesser chance, in my humble opinion.

A few incidental observations, Mr. President, and I shall be through.

First, I cannot ignore the fact that our experienced leaders in trade and commerce, with a very few significant exceptions, almost invariably recommend this loan. Again I quote from the committee report:

The strong public support for this international economic program was impressively demonstrated during the hearings on the proposed joint resolution. Displaying a unanimity of purpose, almost never encountered in the legislative process, representatives of labor, business, finance, industry, and agriculture all appeared before the committee and supported the proposed legislation in enthusiastic terms.

Second. Without this loan Bretton Woods is all but nullified.

Third. We need not fear added imports to balance these new export accounts because the historical record discloses that, except for war periods and the restrictionist thirties, a nation's imports, even of manufactures, have increased on an absolute basis as its home industry grew.

Fourth. Contrary to much fear that the loan will encourage the Socialist regime in Britain, the fact is that a failure of the loan can force—to put it mildly—unintended socialization at emergency speed.

Fifth. Despite persistent prophecy to the contrary, I know of no conclusive reason why the loan should not be paid, unless an important part of the English-speaking world is going to collapse. I am unwilling to entertain that tragic prophecy.

Sixth. I do not consider that I am voting a precedent for any other loan, because there is no other loan which could involve the factors embraced in this one. Mr. President, the committee's report is very distinct on this point, and I read from it one sentence:

It has been made clear to the committee that the British loan is in no way a precedent for other loans, because the proposed credit to Britain is intended to meet a particular problem that does not exist with respect to any other country in the world.

Seventh. I think American labor has been wise to endorse this loan, because stabilized world trade spells jobs.

Eighth. I think American agriculture needs this orderly export.

Mr. President, I wish to commend to the attention of the Senators only a few sentences from the very important testimony of Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, when he appeared before our committee.

Unless credit is advanced to the United Kingdom—

Said Mr. O'Neal, in speaking for the American Farm Bureau Federation—

Unless credit is advanced to the United Kingdom, Britain's only alternative is the placing of certain limitations upon trade with the nonsterling area. American agriculture cannot afford to have these restrictions on trade * * *. Our exports to the United Kingdom were weighted twice as heavily of agricultural products as they were for the world at large.

If this loan is not made—

Mr. O'Neal still speaking—

It will greatly enhance the chances of trading blocs, frozen exchanges, cartels, trade restrictions, and the whole category of things that have in the past, and will in the future, lead to distrust, stifling of trade, and the lowering of living standards for many, many people. I view this loan to Britain as one of the necessary stepping stones in developing a brighter world of tomorrow.

Ninth. I think peace itself has a great stake in what happens upon this issue here in Congress. So does free enterprise and the American way of life.

Mr. President, many of my friends, many of my constituents, and many of my colleagues upon this side of the aisle disagree with me in this matter. I completely respect their view, as I hope they will respect mine. But for the reasons given, I believe it to be my duty to support this joint resolution. If I am wrong, the cost will be relatively small in comparison with the total problem. If they are wrong, the cost would be immense, and could be catastrophic. I choose the lesser gamble in the expectation that events will vindicate such action.

Mr. President, as I conclude, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate during the mission to Paris.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I, also, ask unanimous consent to be excused from the sessions of the Senate for an indefinite period of time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, important as I know will be the mission upon which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] are about to depart, I cannot refrain from expressing my deep regret that the situation calls them away at this particular time. I know how valuable their services will be to the Secretary of State and to our delegation to Paris in connection with the effort to be made to compose a peace treaty involving certain countries of Europe. I would not withhold from our delegation, and from the conference itself, the wisdom, the experience, and the fine judgment of these two colleagues of ours to whom

I have referred. Nevertheless, I deeply and profoundly regret that at this particular juncture, when so many important matters are before the Senate of the United States, the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Texas are required to leave. Of course, I shall not register objection to the requests which they have made. I express, however, my regret that the situation requires their absence at this particular time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency was, on page 2, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized in the manner prescribed by subsection (b) of section 7 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (act of July 31, 1945, Public Law 171, 79th Cong.), to provide and use an amount not to exceed \$3,750,000,000 solely for the purpose of carrying out the agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom. Payments to the United Kingdom under this act and pursuant to the agreement and repayments shall be treated in the manner prescribed by subsection (b) of section 7 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, and payments of interest to the United States shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

And insert:

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction not to exceed \$3,750,000,000 of the proceeds of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are extended to include such purpose. Payments to the United Kingdom under this joint resolution and pursuant to the agreement and repayments thereof shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. Payments of interest to the United States under the agreement shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to explain to the Senate that the committee amendment is a textual amendment which does not change the effective result of the language. It simply means that, without indirectly referring to some other act, the language which is written into the amendment provides in effect that if necessary the funds may be obtained out of funds received from the sale of bonds under the Second Liberty Bond Act, instead of referring to the Bretton Woods Act, which in turn refers to the Second Liberty Bond Act. So this is merely a simplification of the language and has no different meaning, except that anybody who wants to know what act is referred to will find it written out in the statute itself.

Mr. BUCK obtained the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Am I to understand that the business before the Senate is the joint resolution providing for the

British loan or is it the committee amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The direct matter before the Senate is the committee amendment, which is subject to amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is subject to amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is. Mr. CAPEHART. Will the joint resolution itself be subject to amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the committee amendment is adopted it will be; but if there is any amendment to the committee amendment it ought to be offered before the committee amendment is voted upon.

Mr. CAPEHART. One other question. A Senator can offer to amend the joint resolution itself, can he not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; outside of the committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will permit me, I do not know whether he was present when I commented a few moments ago on the fact that this is a textual amendment which the committee inserted as a new section 2, providing a method by which the funds shall be obtained. It does not involve in any way the substantial merits of the joint resolution itself, and would not if adopted bar amendments to the joint resolution except that amendments could not be offered to this particular amendment after it has been agreed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. But, I understand amendments will be in order to the joint resolution itself.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand they will first be in order to the committee amendment and then to the joint resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. I refer to the fact that I have heard that the joint resolution could not be amended, that it must be voted up or voted down. That is not correct, is it?

Mr. BARKLEY. The procedure is the same as in the case of any other joint resolution or bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the committee amendment is adopted the amount will be \$3,750,000,000. Do I understand the majority leader to say that that amount could not be amended and a lesser amount substituted?

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand after it has been agreed to, of course, it cannot be changed.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, if there is to be any amendment offered by which the amount is to be changed it should be offered to the committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will examine the joint resolution he will find that section 2 is the part of the joint resolution which carries the amount. It reads:

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction not to exceed \$3,750,000,000—

And so forth. That is the authority conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury to use that amount of money. The amendment which the committee

reported in section 2 was largely for the purpose of referring directly to the Second Liberty Bond Act as a method by which the money might be obtained as a public-debt transaction. Technically, if the amendment to section 2 is agreed to without amendment it cannot be amended without reconsidering the amendment, and, inasmuch as the committee amendment really carries the substance of the joint resolution itself, it strikes me that it would be entirely proper that any amendment to the joint resolution itself should be offered to the committee amendment and not wait until it is voted upon.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, one other parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I propose to offer an amendment which would change only the amount of money to be loaned. When may I offer that amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such an amendment should be offered to the pending committee amendment, and it is in order at this time. Does the Senator from Indiana desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do, if the Senator from Delaware will yield for that purpose.

Mr. BUCK. It will not take me long to say what I desire to say.

Mr. CAPEHART. Very well.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, a short while ago, a Washington newspaper conducted a poll to disclose who favored the loan to Britain. The question was asked: "Would you approve a loan to help Great Britain get back on its feet?"

First, let us get one thing straight—which this question did not. This is not a loan merely to help Britain. The loan is one element in a positive economic program developed by the Government of the United States which can lead to postwar prosperity in this country, as well as in the rest of the world.

Already, we have taken two important steps toward this goal. The first was the Bretton Woods proposals, now accepted by a majority of countries. The second is the initiative on international trade and related matters proposed by the United States as the basis for discussion at international conferences this year. These two sets of proposals, one concerning finance and one concerning trade, are complementary. Both have the same objective: the development of a set of fair rules for international economic affairs.

Let us, therefore, put the question in another way: "Shall we help our best customer, Britain, to join with us in a co-operative international economic policy, or shall we allow world trade to drift into confusion and restriction, to our own lasting detriment?"

Let me be more specific. International trade has a vital bearing upon prosperity and employment in the United States. To maintain employment, America counts on a thriving and increasing export trade—perhaps 5,000,000 jobs directly and indirectly. This goal can be reached only in a world economy that is expanding and virtually free of restrictions. We live in one world, economically as well as politically.

Back in the thirties, we learned that America cannot remain fully prosperous if half the world is struggling and poverty-stricken.

Nor can America create and promote prosperity single-handed. There are two major world trading nations, the United States and Britain. It is to our advantage to enable Britain to play its full part in helping to reestablish unhampered trade throughout the world. But Britain will not be able to commit herself to the prompt application of the principles of fair currency and trade practices unless she is sure that she can secure essential imports of food and raw materials. That is why the loan is vital. Let me mention here some of the things which Britain has agreed to do if she obtains the loan:

First, England will be able to assume the full obligations of membership in the International Monetary Fund and International Bank set up under the Bretton Woods agreements, and the International Trade Organization, and can afford to abandon trade restrictions which otherwise would have to be continued.

Second, British exchange control will not be used to prevent Americans from converting into dollars the sterling they get from export of goods or other current business with Britain, that is, they will be paid in dollars with no strings attached. This will take effect as soon as the agreement is approved by Congress.

Third, The sterling area dollar pool will be dissolved within a year. Britain will arrange that pounds can be fully converted into dollars in countries whose principal international currency is pounds. This means that a merchant in Bombay, or in Cairo, who sells goods to England can utilize the proceeds in the form of dollars to buy merchandise in the United States.

A fourth consideration, which it might be well to make one of the conditions of the agreement, has been proposed by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] namely:

Permanent acquisition by the United States of rights to military, air, and naval bases held under 99-year leases, and elimination of provisions restricting use of such bases to military or naval purposes only; and

Peacetime commercial use by the United States of other bases built by the United States in the British Empire or in areas controlled by Great Britain.

The loan will introduce a far greater degree of freedom in international trade through the elimination by Britain of exchange controls on current transactions. It will, in addition, provide the opening wedge for the modification of imperial preferences.

I revert now to the question, Why does Britain need our aid, and why is she in difficulty? Briefly, it is that she has been 6 years at war—a very expensive war, as we well know—a war in which our Government spent in a month twice the total of the proposed credit to Britain. For 5 years, the vital export industries of a nation dependent upon foreign trade for existence were switched largely to urgent wartime needs. Normal production was ruthlessly dislocated, factories converted to new purposes, workers dispersed. In

addition to jettisoning two-thirds of her export trade, Britain lost about one-half of her merchant shipping, liquidated a great part of her overseas investments, and incurred heavy indebtedness to countries such as India and Egypt. As a result, Britain is faced today with the task of rebuilding her export industries in order to restore her most important means of buying goods abroad. This cannot be done overnight. What she can earn abroad by sale of exports and services in the immediate postwar years will fall far short of bringing in enough exchange to pay for essential needs. It is evident that a loan is needed to maintain British purchasing power in foreign markets, during the years when she is rebuilding her capacity to earn money for purchases abroad.

Under the proposed loan agreement, the United States will advance a line of credit of \$3,750,000,000 to be drawn against by Great Britain as needed over 5 years. During this period of recovery, the British people would thus be able to buy the goods they need from abroad in order to help maintain the country's economy while it gets back to full peacetime production. The payment of interest and principal would begin in 1951, and continue for 50 years until the loan was paid off. Some believe we should make the British an outright gift. But it was not so decided.

The question has been asked whether the loan would be a precedent for similar loans to other countries. This has been answered by Mr. Vinson—the loan to Britain is considered to be in a category all its own. Loans to other countries will be effectuated through the Export-Import Bank. Each country's request for a loan would have to be judged on its own merits.

Would the loan, others inquire, be inflationary? Only to a negligible degree. The loan is to be drawn on over a period of 5 years, and it is expected that Britain will only spend the proceeds to a limited extent in 1946, and not all of this necessarily in the United States. The amount that Britain will purchase here during 1946 as a result of the loan is likely to be less than 1 percent of the value of United States production in 1946. This could hardly be called inflationary.

In any case, the sort of things that Britain will want to buy from America in 1946 are mainly items which will be in good supply, such as burley tobacco, raw cotton, turpentine, and those agricultural products of which surpluses are in evidence from time to time. Despite the tight supply situation, certain foods which Britain could use have attained a state of surplus during recent months. Today we are faced with one of the largest poultry surpluses in the country's whole history, particularly along the Atlantic seaboard. Cold-storage stocks are at peak levels. A heavy flood of poultry is expected to reach the market. There is danger that some of these holdings may spoil by the end of the summer. Purchases by Britain would, consequently, be most welcome to the poultry industry. Eggs are also in an easier position along the east coast, and a sizable surplus may be in evidence by summer.

England is short of eggs, both dried and fresh.

Many industrial products are also in adequate supply and would be available for export to Britain in the near future. These items include aluminum, magnesium, certain heavy chemicals, crude synthetic rubber, petroleum products, ships, second-hand machine tools, and general war surpluses. As far as scarce items are concerned, manufacturers and producers in the United States are already booked well ahead and could not accept orders from Britain at this date. Even if such manufacturers were disposed to sell to Britain in preference to domestic consumers, they could not obtain the necessary export licenses. Purchases of these products by Britain will thus be postponed to a time when the most insistent part of the present deferred demand in the United States has been satisfied.

The large expenditures resulting from the loan will come in 1947 and subsequent years when goods are once again in more abundant supply in the United States. British purchases should cushion any decline in domestic demand that takes place during the closing months of 1947 and in 1948. Output in the United States would thereby be sustained at a higher level as a result of the loan.

Can we afford the loan and are we likely to be paid back? If the \$3,750,000,000 were an outright grant, it would increase our national debt by about 1 percent. Had the war lasted 2 weeks longer, this amount would have been spent to cover the cost of the additional 2 weeks' period. It is certainly the expectation that the loan will be repaid. Britain has assets, productive power, and commercial skill. What she needs is a chance to come back. In order to meet the interest charges and repay capital, Britain will have to pay us each year \$140,000,000. In the context of expanding world economy, Britain should be able to do this, unless trade barriers are placed in her way.

Let us now look at the other side of the picture and consider what the result would be of refusing the loan. Such a refusal would throw Britain back on her own resources and on those of her closest friends and relations. Britain would have to draw in her belt still tighter. Food rationing, clothes rationing, would have to be continued. Reconversion would be delayed.

If the loan should not be granted, Britain would have to intensify her defensive financial and commercial arrangement, with the result that she would be unable to continue in the Bretton Woods Fund and Bank or subscribe to the proposals for an International Trade Organization. Moreover, Britain would be forced to obtain her essential imports from countries willing and able to supply them in return for pounds sterling which would be spent in Britain at some later time. She would spend her limited dollar resources for absolute necessities. Imports of automobiles, petroleum products, movie films, timber, cotton, tobacco, food, and other farm products would be slashed or prohibited, even after these products have become

far more abundant in the United States.

Without the loan, Britain's wartime controls over imports would have to be continued indefinitely. She would be obliged to arrange bilateral trade agreements with her dominions and dependencies and with any other country whose major export market is in Britain. She would be forced to maintain rigidly severe exchange controls, tariff preferences, quota restrictions, and to build up a sterling trading area as large and exclusive as possible.

American trade would be seriously hurt. Not only would the British have to abstain as much as possible from buying American goods—and Britain used to be our most important customer—but the whole system of quotas and bilateral agreements would lead to an inevitable contraction of opportunities for the sale of American goods abroad.

The United States would, in turn, have to build up a dollar bloc. In the end we should be faced with two competitive and restrictive trading areas with the resultant difficulties and frictions that these would cause. It would mean the end of our hopes of re-creating an international system in which unhampered multilateral trade can operate. Our own American program of full employment and full protection would be difficult to achieve in such circumstances. The moral of all this is that the denial of the loan to Britain would hurt both countries.

Let me repeat what I said earlier, that there are two major factors in world trade—the United States and Britain. We cannot have a really prosperous world if one of these countries is unable to throw away the financial and economic crutches it has found necessary after the injuries inflicted on its resources and trade, by a devastating war. It is to our plain advantage in this situation to extend to Britain the financial aid without which world recovery, so necessary to our own prosperity, would proceed slowly and uncertainly.

All this and more is what the financial agreement with Britain involves. Purely on the economic side it is an investment in the future—ours as well as Britain's. Its return will not be the 2 percent interest we shall get, but much more important, the enjoyment of growing markets, the increased welfare an expanded foreign trade can bring to all of us.

It remains for the Congress of the United States to choose whether to extend credit to Britain and gamble that with its own continued prosperity, and with the help of the World Fund and Bank, a multilateral expansion of trade will take place, or reject the loan and force Britain to take a long and dangerous step down a road that in the past has led to economic and military warfare.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Bilbo	Bushfield
Austin	Brewster	Butler
Ball	Bridges	Capehart
Bankhead	Brooks	Carville
Barkley	Buck	Connally

Cordon	Kilgore
Donnell	Knowland
Downey	La Follette
Eastland	Langer
Ellender	Lucas
Ferguson	McCarran
Fulbright	McClellan
Gerry	McFarland
Gossett	McKellar
Green	McMahon
Guffey	Maybank
Gurney	Millikin
Hart	Mitchell
Hatch	Morse
Hayden	Murdock
Hickenlooper	Murray
Hill	Myers
Huffman	O'Daniel
Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb

Robertson
Russell
Saitonstall
Shipstead
Smith
Taft
Taylor
Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Tydings
Vandenberg
Wagner
Wheeler
Wherry
White
Wiley
Wills
Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to promote the common defense of the United States of America by coordinating the departments and agencies of the Government relating to the common defense, to establish a Department of Air, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill and to have it referred to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2102) to promote the common defense of the United States of America by coordinating the departments and agencies of the Government relating to the common defense, to establish a Department of Air, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the bill is introduced with the hope that it will be used as a substitute for S. 2044, a bill on the same subject now pending in the committee.

In the past few days a controversy which has been continuously active for months has become even deeper and more widespread. Much attention has been given to the difference of opinion which exists regarding the proposed merger of our armed forces. Little mention has been made of the wide area of agreement which exists among all who have conscientiously studied the merger question. Emphasis so far has been placed upon the contrary thoughts of spokesmen for the Army and Navy. Hence, there has arisen in some quarters a feeling that the differences cannot be resolved and that there can be no unity on the question of unity of the armed services.

I believe that if this question is approached without either prejudice or bias the differences can be resolved. This is not an issue for executive decision or departmental argument. This issue is of endless importance, for it involves the future safety and security of the Nation. The question is one for which the Congress must find the wisest solution possible. A wise solution cannot be found if those who are charged with the responsibility of searching for it are persuaded to champion the cause of any particular group. The only cause which should be championed in relation to this question is the cause of the American people. They are interested in the future security of the country. They are interested in the

best plan which can be devised to insure that security.

When the controversy over unity of the armed forces began, many of us believed that the right answer lay between the extreme claims of the partisans. I, for one, believed that the Military Affairs Subcommittee would arrive at that right answer in its report to the full committee. A study of that report, however, can lead only to the conclusion that as Senate bill 2044 stands now it is almost wholly a strictly military offering which the executive branch of the Government in effect demands that the Congress of the United States approve.

The President can propose and the armed services can suggest. But this legislative decision is for the Congress itself to render. We must not dodge the responsibility. We must not be hustled or driven to a decision in which we cannot sincerely believe. The subject is too important. The steps we are asked to take are too historic for us to evade a complete exploration of the path we are asked to set the Nation's feet upon.

I want to briefly refer to the objections some of us who have studied the bill have to Senate bill 2044.

The bill has not had full and unbiased consideration. The subcommittee heard 30 witnesses. Twenty-seven of the witnesses were from the War and Navy Departments. Naturally, they put forward their special interests. Citizens of all walks of life should be heard, for it is one of the major, if not the most important, issues before them today.

Senate bill 2044 should emphasize unity, not unification. Our objective should be unity which is over-all and comprehensive. It should be a unity which could preserve the full spirit which has always existed within the respective armed services.

Senate bill 2044 would in effect eliminate the War and Navy Departments, and would merge all our armed forces into a single department headed by a single civilian Secretary and a single military Chief of Staff. Such a proposal in the opinion of many of us subscribes to a militaristic doctrine which has always been foreign to American thinking and could only weaken the country. Such an arrangement as is proposed by Senate bill 2044 would drastically reduce civilian control over the military only a few months after the ending of the war which was fought because of militaristic and totalitarian control of other nations. The people of the United States have never supported any proposal which would weaken civilian control of the armed forces of the country. I hope and think they never will.

Senate bill 2044 would place in the hands of a single Government official more power than any single American should have. In addition to the undesirable power such a single official would have, the responsibility would be greater than one man could handle efficiently. There are those of us who believe that such a concentration of power in the hands of one individual is a threat to the future of this country as a democracy.

By the authority of Senate bill 2044 there could grow under the single Secretary of Common Defense, a general staff

which in time could become as infamous as others the world has known. The bill does not offer sound participation of the respective armed services in the coordination of our foreign policy.

Senate bill 2044 would, in my opinion, result in a dangerous lack of balance between the respective armed services.

The bill would eliminate the demonstrated strength of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Constitution charges the Congress with the duty to carefully watch the military departments. The bill as it stands could endanger the complete performance of that duty.

Senate bill 2044 in its present form does not give adequate consideration to research and development which are, of course, of utmost importance to our future security.

The bill, as it stands, lacks real provisions for coordination at the top level. That is where coordination is most needed if there is to be coordination below.

Those in brief are some of the objections to Senate bill 2044. I do not want to take the time of the Senate today to discuss in detail the bill I am introducing, for I am hopeful that full opportunity will be given for a complete study of it. I will briefly refer to the highlights of its provisions.

The bill contains proposals which have long been put forward as a solution to the question of how to effectively unify the armed forces of the country. They are included in my bill as a result of extended attention to the entire issue.

The bill would create a Council of Common Defense. Members of the Council would be the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Forces. The President of the United States would be the Chairman of the Council. He would be authorized to appoint from civilian life a deputy by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The deputy would be known as the Coordinator of Common Defense. His duties would be specified and in the President's absence he could act as Chairman of the Council.

By my bill the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be retained and would consist of the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Commanding General of the Air Forces.

By my bill a military education and training board would be established under the supervision and direction of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

An advisory board on military education and training would be established to be composed of the board and four additional members appointed by the President from civilian life.

Within the council of common defense there would be a central research and development agency.

Within the council of common defense there would be a central intelligence agency, the director of which would be appointed by the President. In the agency would be representatives of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, the Departments of State and the Treasury, and a representative of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and such other representatives as the council of common defense

might recommend and the President approve.

By my bill there would be within the council of common defense a military munitions board. The chairman would be appointed by the President from civilian life, and other members would be from the secretariat of the Army, Navy, the Air Forces, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission.

By my bill there would be established within the council of common defense a national security resources board, whose chairman would be appointed from civilian life by the President. The chairman of the military munitions board would be a member, and there would be such other members as the President should designate.

The bill I have introduced would establish a department of air, within which would be established a military force which would be known as the Air Forces of the United States. The President would be empowered to perfect the organization of this department of air.

Under the terms of my bill, the Secretary of War would be known as the Secretary for the Army. The Secretary of the Navy would be known, as now, as the Secretary for the Navy.

My bill would authorize the President, through the Coordinator of Common Defense, to make a complete study and investigation with reference to the organization and functions of the medical organizations of all the armed services, with the view of recommending to the Congress such legislation as may be necessary to provide for the highest degree of coordination of these medical organizations.

I believe this bill meets the President's original thoughts relative to unity of the armed forces. I believe it provides a sound democratic approach to that unity which is desired and desirable. I believe the bill is such as to end this unfortunate controversy and gain the support of the American people.

I call now for early hearings on my bill. I ask that in a spirit of cooperation and unity the Senate Committees on both Naval and Military Affairs meet jointly to consider this bill and to reach a wise decision, and thereby to eliminate the present bickering, and take steps to really insure the security of the United States of America in a democratic way, which is the goal we all seek.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 138, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 3, at the beginning of line 7, it is proposed to strike

out "\$3,750,000,000" and insert "\$1,500,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana to the committee amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gossett	Morse
Austin	Green	Murdoch
Ball	Guffey	Murray
Bankhead	Gurney	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hart	Reed
Bilbo	Hatch	Revercomb
Brewster	Hayden	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brooks	Hill	Saltonstall
Buck	Huffman	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Johnson, S. C.	Taft
Byrd	Kilgore	Taylor
Capehart	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Lucas	Tydings
Cordon	McCarran	Vandenberg
Donnell	McClellan	Wagner
Downey	McFarland	Wheeler
Eastland	McKellar	Wherry
Ellender	McMahon	White
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Willis
Gerry	Mitchell	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. For what purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment amending section 2 be acted on without affecting other amendments to that section. There are several amendments which are to be proposed to section 2. I do not know of any opposition to the committee amendment, because it merely changes the procedure, but if it shall be agreed to before the other amendments are offered, then the other amendments will be ruled out of order.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Chair ruled a moment ago that my amendment reducing the amount from \$3,750,000,000 to \$1,500,000,000 had to be offered at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understand that that is the parliamentary situation, but if the unanimous consent I am requesting should be granted, then the Senator's amendment could come along at any time, because all I am asking is that other amendments be not barred by the adoption of the committee amendment, to which there is no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Senator from Colorado is suggesting is that the committee amendment be adopted, and that thereafter the committee amendment may be changed by any further amendment that might be offered to it. In other words, he is asking that the committee amendment be regarded as the

text of the joint resolution, to which amendments could be offered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is rather unusual parliamentary procedure in the Senate that a committee amendment should be adopted, and that then it should be subject to further amendment. No inconvenience results from offering an amendment to the committee amendment except that no amendment in the third degree could be offered. After the amendment of the Senator from Indiana has been voted on, whether it is adopted or rejected, other amendments to the language of the committee amendment can be offered. So there is no particular advantage that I can see in deviating from the parliamentary procedure of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The only disadvantage is that such amendments as Senators would like to have considered would have to be brought up before action is taken on the committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true, and any changes desired to be made in the committee amendment would have to be adopted before the committee amendment is finally agreed to by the Senate. But that does not in any way deny any Senator the right to offer an amendment to the language of the committee amendment. If the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is rejected, or if it is agreed to, then other amendments can be offered to the language of the committee amendment.

It is such an unusual thing to ask that a committee amendment be adopted, and then that it be in order to offer amendments to change it, that I do not recall it ever having been done, except where the committee strikes out all after the enacting clause and reports in an entirely new bill. In that event the language contained in the single committee amendment is regarded as the text of the bill. That is not the situation in this instance.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has objected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Before the objection is made, I want to point out the fact that the authorization to enter into an agreement binding the United States to pay \$3,750,000,000 is contained in the first section of the amendment. The second section simply provides a means by which the Secretary of the Treasury may get the money to pay without an appropriation. The committee amendment is not for the purpose of changing the amount. It is merely to meet objections which were made to the exact manner in which the \$3,750,000,000 was to be raised. The committee amendment does not change the \$3,750,000,000. It simply changes a purely technical detail. It seems to me it would contribute to the clarity of our proceedings if we simply adopted that amendment by unanimous consent, thereby correcting the joint resolution—it is an amendment merely corrective in

nature—and then permit amendments to be offered to the whole joint resolution. It might be said there would have to be a further amendment in section 1. The mere change of the \$3,750,000,000 in section 2 would not change the amount that may be authorized by the joint resolution. The thing is quite confused, and I think it would contribute to the clarity of the debate if we could have this amendment adopted by unanimous consent, and then consider the language as if it were that of the original joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. The original joint resolution contains section 2, providing the method by which the money might be obtained, if necessary. As a matter of fact, under the law the Secretary of the Treasury could pay out of the Treasury an amount drawn upon by the British Government, if we had that much cash at any given time. He would not have to sell bonds to pay the money.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and he now has \$20,000,000,000 in cash in the Treasury.

Mr. BARKLEY. He is merely authorized to proceed under the Second Liberty Bond Act if he has to do it. So the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, even if it were to be adopted, would simply mean that the Secretary of the Treasury could only sell bonds under the Second Liberty Loan Act for the amount of \$1,500,000,000 and pay the rest of the loan out of cash balances in the Treasury. It would not affect the terms of the agreement in any respect.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I made a parliamentary inquiry about an hour ago. The inquiry was whether it was possible to amend this measure, and I was told that it was.

Mr. BARKLEY. The answer to the Senator's question was correct. That does not preclude the right of any Senator to offer an amendment to section 1, which might change the agreement itself if it were adopted. We will discuss that when we reach it, if such an amendment is offered. But the amendment on page 3 in section 2 is merely the procedure by which the Secretary of the Treasury shall obtain the money to carry out the agreement mentioned in section 1. I would rather not at this point agree to the adoption of the committee amendment, section 2. I might do so later, but I would rather not do it at this point, because I do not see any particular good that can be accomplished by it, because no amendment to this section, so far as the amount is concerned, would affect the provisions of section 1, or the agreement itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. All I was trying to do in making the unanimous-consent request was to clarify the whole situation so that no Senator would be foreclosed from offering amendments to the joint resolution. I do not believe any Member of the Senate wants to jockey any other Senator out of position so that he could not offer an amendment. The matter which we are considering is very important, and certainly no parliamentary handicap should be placed in the consideration of the joint resolution.

I understand that my amendment will have to be offered before the committee amendment is considered. If I do not offer my amendment first, then I will be foreclosed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know when the Senator wants to offer his amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana presumably will be voted upon, after which, whatever the result of the vote, the committee amendment would still be open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I can offer my amendment at that time, and there may be other amendments to be offered at that time, but—

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that some Senator would want to offer an amendment to section 1, which would not be involved in any way by the committee amendment. I hope that I shall not be considered as encouraging any amendment to section 1, but it is a part of the joint resolution, and amendments would be in order to it as long as the joint resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. President, I think in the interest of orderly procedure now for the moment, that we ought to dispose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana before any agreement is reached with respect to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana to the committee amendment is the pending amendment. Objection was made to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, after this discussion I think I should make a statement. The Chair ruled that it was necessary for me to offer the first portion of my amendment at this time in order to change the amount from \$3,750,000,000 in section 2 to \$1,500,000,000. However, the Chair likewise ruled that I could not offer at this time as an amendment to the committee amendment a new section which I shall offer as an amendment later, when it is proper to do so, to be known as section 3, which would provide how the \$1,500,000,000 shall be spent. That, in effect, would change the terms of the agreement.

Mr. President, after listening to the able statement made by the Senator from Michigan earlier today, I find only four reasons advanced by him for making the British loan in the amount of \$3,750,000,000. No. 1 is that they need the money. I presume they do. We all need more money than we have. I am surprised that someone does not say that we in America need money because we have a national debt of \$275,000,000,000. So we likewise need money.

The second reason advanced for the loan is that Great Britain will not change her so-called bad trade practices unless we make this loan to her.

The third reason advanced is that if we make this loan to Britain it will enable the world to proceed on the basis of multilateral trade agreements, and eliminate what are commonly known as bilateral trade agreements.

The fourth reason advanced is purely a sentimental reason.

Mr. President, I fail to find any other reason than the four I have enumerated for making the loan. After listening to the able Senator from Michigan today I fail to find any other reason than the four I have just mentioned.

So far as reason No. 1 is concerned, that Great Britain needs the money. My opinion is that Great Britain can get along on a lesser amount.

As to reason No. 2, that Great Britain will not change certain bad trade practices unless we loan her the money, I do not think that to be a valid argument in favor of the loan. I cannot conceive of this body taking that argument seriously. I simply cannot conceive—I dislike to make this statement, but it is nevertheless true—I simply cannot conceive of the United States bribing any nation to adopt good trade practices. I understand England will maintain that in order to protect herself she must indulge in certain trade practices; but that policy certainly is not a one-way street. If the practices in which she is indulging are bad, it seems to me that she herself should change them.

A third argument is that the loan will enable the world to eliminate bilateral trade agreements. I should like to ask a question. I note that the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is in the Chamber. Is it not a fact that under our reciprocal trade agreements, our quota arrangements in themselves constitute bilateral trade agreements?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hesitate to undertake to answer the question of the Senator from Indiana without consulting the record; but I believe there is a clause in those trade agreements which makes them applicable to all other countries which desire to accept them.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand that. Mr. CONNALLY. So in that sense they are not bilateral. They are multilateral.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is not the quota system which we established in connection with our reciprocal trade agreements in reality a bilateral trade agreement? For example, recently we reduced the quota of watches imported into this country from Switzerland. As I recall Switzerland had a quota of 5,000,000, and I believe we reduced it to 2,500,000. Is not that a bilateral trade agreement?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has asked the question and answered it himself, so I do not see any occasion for injecting my comments.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, the Senator from Indiana evidently has reference to a trade agreement between the United States and Switzerland, Switzerland being practically the only country which to any extent manufactures watches which are imported into the United States. However, as the Senator from Texas stated a moment ago, in the law authorizing the making of trade agreements there is a provision that any other nation or any number of nations

which may accept the same terms may enter into the agreements, which become multilateral to that extent. It is true, of course, that a single agreement made between the United States and Switzerland with respect to watches, to which no other nation was a party, would, to that extent, be a bilateral agreement.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Perhaps this example of a trade agreement is safe to go on. It is the agreement between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. I think we may safely say that it is bilateral in the sense that there are two parties to the agreement, but it is multilateral in the sense of being applicable to many nations, and applicable immediately. Article VI of the agreement, found at page 5 of series No. 64 of executive agreement, provides as follows:

All of the provisions of this agreement providing for most-favored-nation treatment shall be interpreted as meaning that such treatment shall be accorded immediately and unconditionally without request or compensation.

Mr. CAPEHART. That agreement applied to tariffs.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The answer which I gave the Senator a while ago was made without opportunity to consult the law and the agreements. With the record before him, the Senator from Vermont has confirmed, I think, what I stated.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, some of the treaties are bilateral in the sense that two nations get together and make the initial agreement, but under the clauses in the agreements they are applicable to any other countries which wish to accept the same terms and come in on the same basis. In that sense—which is the real sense, because it is the operative sense—they are not bilateral if any other nation accepts them.

Mr. CAPEHART. They are bilateral so far as the quota arrangement is concerned. It is my understanding that in all the agreements which we make we establish a quota for each country. Therefore I feel that while in theory they may not be bilateral, in practice they are bilateral agreements.

Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is, first, to reduce the amount from \$3,750,000,000 to \$1,500,000,000. If this amendment is agreed to I shall offer an amendment providing how the \$1,500,000,000 shall be loaned to Great Britain. Under the terms of my amendment it would be loaned during the years 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950 in an amount each year not to exceed the total amount of Great Britain's deficit in trading directly with us. That would encourage Great Britain to do business with us. It would encourage us to do business with Great Britain. It would help Great Britain to the extent of \$1,500,000,000. It would make certain that we should do business directly, and that our farmers, laborers, and industry would get the direct benefit of this loan.

I, for one, would be willing to lend money to any nation throughout the world on that basis, because, in my opinion, that would be a good straight business loan. It would be a loan which almost any businessman or bank would make. I am opposed to lending Great Britain \$3,750,000,000, giving her the money to spend as she sees fit, anywhere in competition with the United States throughout the world. She could use the \$3,750,000,000, if she cared to do so, to socialize railroads in England, to socialize coal mines, or to socialize the manufacturing business. She could use it in any way she saw fit. I do not say that she would use it for such purposes, but she might use it in that manner.

Furthermore, Great Britain has not agreed and does not agree in the agreement dated December 6, 1945, to eliminate the bad trade practices which the proponents of the joint resolution maintain that the loan would eliminate. I want to have the record underscore that fact. She does not agree to do it. She says that she will do the best she can to eliminate bad trade practices, but she does not definitely agree to do so.

Mr. President, I hope that my amendment will be adopted. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this amendment reminds me of the old story about the man who walked up to one of his neighbors who was supposed to be deaf and asked him, "Will you lend me \$5?" The other man said, "How is that?" The first man said, "Will you lend me \$10?" His friend replied, "I thought you said \$5." [Laughter.]

The Senator from Indiana is against the whole proposal. He is against lending any money to Great Britain under this agreement, and has announced his position. He will vote against it, no matter what the amount finally agreed upon may be.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am certain that the Senator is misinformed on that point, because I made a speech Friday in which I stated that I could not support the British loan in its present form.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood that the Senator was against the whole theory of the loan. If I misunderstood him I am sorry.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am certain the Senator will be very happy to change his statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator says that I am wrong in assuming that he will vote against the joint resolution—

Mr. CAPEHART. I will vote against the \$3,750,000,000 loan. I will vote for a loan on the basis of \$1,500,000,000, giving Great Britain sufficient money to make up her deficit in trading with us for the next 5 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know that it is worth while to argue on the floor of the Senate with respect to this or any other amendment, with so few Senators in attendance. It seems to me to be an act of futility to consume the time of the Senate when apparently Senators are not sufficiently interested

to attend sessions of the Senate. Perhaps they are already prepared to vote and know in advance how they are going to vote on every possible amendment. It seems utterly useless and futile to consume the time of the Senate in arguing this or any other amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. This morning in the Committee on Banking and Currency the Senator himself stated that no vote on the joint resolution was expected today. I understood that statement to cover also the amendments. Personally I do not believe that there should be any votes today. Three committees have set meetings for 2:30 o'clock this afternoon on the theory that there was to be no vote today. They are the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. I made that statement in the Committee on Banking and Currency, based upon the theory that the debate would continue all day, and that there would be no vote. Therefore, I rather encouraged the Committee on Banking and Currency to hold a session this afternoon. I did not know at that time that the speech making would terminate so unexpectedly and so happily. I am not speaking about voting. I am speaking about whether it is worth while to argue the merits of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana with so many Senators absent from the Chamber. I am not complaining at that, either. I am merely arguing with myself as to whether it is worth while to take the time of the Senate when so few Senators are present.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Inasmuch as it is not worth while, I suggest that we vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. In addition to what I stated before the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning, I rather held out to members of the committee and to other Senators the notion that there would be no vote today, for the reasons which I have already explained. I should like to have the opportunity to discuss, in a few minutes, the merits of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana before it is finally voted upon. The yeas and nays have been ordered upon the amendment. I do not mean to intimate that I would be wholly wasting my time if I were to address myself to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and one or two other Senators who do me the honor to be present and listen to what I have to say.

Mr. WHERRY. And 15 Republican Senators on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is all right. I am not taking a census. I do not care what side they are on, or how many sides they are on. I think it is to be deplored—and I say it on my responsibility as a Senator occupying the desk which I occupy—that during this entire debate there has been very meager attendance on the floor of the Senate on either side of the Chamber to discuss these questions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I assure the distinguished majority leader that I agree with him. I am sure that all Senators agree that we should have a good attendance during the discussion of a measure so important as is the British loan. When the Senator from Kentucky complained of the small number of Senators who were present to hear him discuss this amendment I suggested that 15 Republican Members were present. I do not believe that my suggestion justifies the statement which the distinguished majority leader has made.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it only gives evidence of the inevitable and irrepressible spirit of partisanship which now and then arises in the breast of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, once again I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his high compliment. I always have taken an interest in my party.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I think I can say to the distinguished majority leader that earlier today there was a full attendance in the Senate when the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] gave what was, I think, even though I cannot agree with him in regard to many of his statements, one of the finest speeches which has been made on the question of the British loan.

Mr. BARKLEY. With that statement I thoroughly agree.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. So we had a full attendance in the Senate at that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the Senate has not done its duty when, after it listens to such an important and outstanding speech, it then makes an exodus which makes the exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt look like a static situation. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, to bring us from the Holy Scriptures to a more or less atomic-bomb situation here, I should like to suggest to the distinguished majority leader that if he would accept the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado, adopt the committee amendment, and then, by unanimous consent, leave the amendment open to subsequent amendment without any parliamentary difficulty, we probably would have further discussion on the joint resolution this afternoon.

Mr. BARKLEY. But that would not change the situation in any respect.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it would.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so. All the amendments which would be offered to the joint resolution in that event can be offered to the pending amendment, except to section 1, which is the real meat, and which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the agreement—which he could do, if he had the money, without borrowing a dime.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I submit that once we adopt the amendment providing for an amount of \$3,750,000,000, we cannot change the amount. Once it is adopted, that amount stands.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; once that is done, we cannot change it, except by agreeing by unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. But that still does not preclude any Senator from offering any amendment he wishes to offer. I do not know that any advantage would be gained either one way or another by acceding to the suggestion, but it would be a departure from the customary procedure in the Senate in regard to adopting amendments to a measure.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suppose what I shall say about this amendment now will have to be repeated, if it is thought worth while to do so, at some other time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Kentucky wish to have the absence of a quorum suggested?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not want a quorum to be called at this time. I do not wish to interfere with the pleasure or routine or other work of Senators who are elsewhere at the moment. If we are not to vote on this amendment this afternoon, I hope they will take the time to read what little I shall have to say about it.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana, even if we had already adopted the amendment according to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Colorado, would not change the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in any respect except in regard to the method by which he would raise the money to pay the obligation we assume in providing that he may loan \$3,750,000,000 to Great Britain.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. We all understand that the loan is not to be made all at one time. It is to be a line of credit which the United Kingdom can call upon at any time during a period of 5 years. They may ask for \$500,000,000 of it at one time; they may ask for \$1,000,000,000 of it at some other time. As they request amounts of money, whatever they may be, such amounts or an equivalent line of credit will be accorded to the United Kingdom; and the money representing the credit will, I suppose, according to the mechanics of the procedure, be deposited in the Federal Reserve bank at New York, and the Government of the United Kingdom will then be able to draw upon it for purchases, as indicated as the purpose of the agreement. That process may extend over a period of 5 years.

At any one time when the Secretary is called upon to place on deposit in the Federal Reserve bank \$500,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000 or \$1,500,000,000 or \$2,500,000,000, according to the necessities of the United Kingdom, if he has in the Treasury money out of which he can make the

allotment, he will not have to issue any bonds at all in order to obtain the money.

Section 2 of the joint resolution, or the committee amendment, to which the Senator from Indiana has offered his amendment, merely authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain the money under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, just as he is authorized to obtain the money for the Bretton Woods International Fund and for our contribution to the stock of the International Bank by the sale of bonds under the Second Liberty Bond Act. But if there is in the Treasury money which is available and is not otherwise needed at the time, the Secretary of the Treasury may use that money, without borrowing a dollar by means of the sale of bonds. But that does not affect the agreement itself to make \$3,750,000,000 available to Britain during a period of 5 years.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Vermont, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky seems to anticipate my questions and to answer them just before I have an opportunity to ask them. So I do not ask him to yield to me now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I claim no powers of clairvoyance, but ordinarily the Senator's language is so clear and distinct that sometimes I even seem to know what his mind is going to be before he speaks it.

Mr. AIKEN. I was going to ask whether the Secretary of the Treasury will be precluded from making payments on this loan from any money which he obtains in a manner other than through the issuance of securities under the Second Liberty Bond Act. The Senator from Kentucky answered that question just before I asked it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Secretary of the Treasury is not precluded. The truth of the matter is that if section 2 were entirely eliminated from this measure, the Secretary of the Treasury could, during the 5-year period, pay to Great Britain the entire \$3,750,000,000 in cash, out of any balances in the Treasury. But in order to meet any contingency which might arise during the 5-year period, which might require him to issue bonds in order to obtain the money at any given time, section 2 is included in the measure, so as to authorize him to carry out the public debt transaction under the terms of the Second Liberty Bond Act. But that provision does not affect the terms of the agreement itself. It merely applies to the way by which he can raise the money needed under the agreement.

So I say to the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Indiana that any amendment seeking to change the method by which we raise the money needed to enable us to accord to England such a line of credit will have to be an amendment to the joint resolution itself, and not simply as to the method of raising the money.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. What the Senator has just said is very definitely understood. We talked about that awhile ago, and I stated at the time the Chair ruled

that in order for me to add a new section, which I propose to do, it will be necessary to strike out the amount "\$3,750,000,000" and insert "\$1,500,000,000."

The real meat of my amendment—or amendments, for there really are two of them—is contained in the one I shall offer to the joint resolution, not to the committee amendment. However, due to a technicality, I am placed in the position of having to offer this amendment at the moment, in order to protect myself.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, there is nothing mysterious about the mechanics of the parliamentary procedure in regard to the pending amendment. Section 2 of the joint resolution, which is the committee amendment, simply provides the method by which the money can be obtained, if necessary. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, if necessary—and, of course, an authorization always carries with it the implication that it may or may not be necessary—if necessary in order to raise the \$3,750,000,000, to sell bonds under the Second Liberty Bond Act.

As I said awhile ago, if we had not put this section in the joint resolution it would still be possible to carry out the agreement and pay the necessary amount out of whatever balance remained on hand, and without the necessity of floating a bond issue. But, in order to take care of that contingency, because \$22,000,000,000 is now in the Treasury in the form of a balance as a result of unforeseen situations which arose, including a very wholesome oversale of the last Liberty bond drive, it was thought wise to follow the plan which has been suggested. It is not contemplated that we shall maintain any such balance over an indefinite period of time. Therefore, it may occur that before the 5-year period expires it will be necessary to issue bonds in order to take care of this amount; and the second section of the joint resolution provides how it shall be done. But if we could be sure that there will always be in the Treasury sufficient money in the form of a balance, out of taxes and other sources, to give the proposed line of credit over a period of 5 years, we would not necessarily have to incorporate section 2 in the joint resolution. So, a mere reduction in the amount by which the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to issue bonds in order to obtain money would not in any way change the agreement. Therefore, the amendment is futile and inconsistent.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to read an amendment to be known as section 3, which I shall offer later to the joint resolution:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution or any provision of the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom, there shall be advanced under said agreement only such sums by way of credit as shall be necessary to offset adverse trade balances of the United Kingdom with the United States for the years 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950, not exceeding in the aggregate the sum of \$1,500,000,000.

I expect to offer that provision as an amendment to the joint resolution. The Chair has ruled that in order to offer the amendment I must likewise offer an amendment to reduce the amount of \$3,750,000,000 in section 2 of the joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the pending question is the committee amendment. The Senator, in a sense, has attempted to anticipate the amendment which he has offered to the substance of the agreement by offering the amendment so that if his other amendment should be adopted the Secretary would not be authorized to raise, by bonds or otherwise, more than \$1,500,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the agreement.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. So there is no inconsistency in the ruling of the Chair or in the parliamentary situation. Of course, the Senator understands that I am opposed to both his amendments.

Mr. CAPEHART. Absolutely; that would be understood.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It seems to me that the Senator from Indiana, in offering his amendment, is placed in an embarrassing situation. He is forced by the parliamentary situation to place the cart before the horse. Subsequently, when the amendment is voted upon by the Senate, the Members of the Senate will be in the uncomfortable position, at least, of being required to vote for an amendment which is not complete. Because of that situation I made a unanimous consent request to cure it by allowing the committee amendment to be agreed to without prejudice to other amendments. If Senators then desired to offer amendments they would be in position to do so in an intelligent manner, and the Senate would be in a position to consider them in an intelligent manner. But the Senator from Kentucky objected to the procedure which I suggested, and undertook to criticize the Senator from Indiana because he put the cart before the horse.

Mr. BARKLEY. No, no; I am not criticizing the Senator from Indiana. I am trying to explain what is the effect of his amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but what the Senator refers to is only a part of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it is the whole amendment, so far as section 2 of the joint resolution is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, yes; it is the whole amendment so far as section 2 of the joint resolution is concerned, but the Senator from Indiana was forced by the parliamentary situation to offer the amendment ahead of his other amendment. Otherwise he would be foreclosed from submitting the amendment at any time. That is the situation about which I was complaining, and which I was trying to correct by asking unanimous consent to allow the committee amendment to be agreed to with-

out prejudice to other amendments which might follow.

Mr. BARKLEY. The parliamentary situation in regard to the pending joint resolution does not differ from that which pertains to any other resolution or bill which may become before the Senate with a committee amendment. The mere fact that it pertains to the British loan, and to an agreement which was entered into between this Government and the Government of Great Britain, does not change the parliamentary situation. I do not quite understand why we should be required or expected to change our parliamentary procedure merely because of the agreement which has been entered into between the United States and the United Kingdom. I certainly offer no criticism of the Senator from Indiana, or any other Senator who wishes to offer an amendment to the committee amendment, or to the joint resolution itself. It so happens, however, that because the committee amendment is the pending question before the Senate, amendments to the committee amendment must be disposed of before amendments to the joint resolution itself may be offered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The difficulty with the situation is that the Senator from Indiana, and other Senators under similar circumstances, must take their amendments apart. They must submit a part of their amendments to one part of the joint resolution, and another part of their amendments to another part of the joint resolution, and they must have their amendments to the committee amendment considered first. The unanimous-consent request which I made was only in the interest of clarity. The joint resolution is very short. It consists of only three pages, including the committee amendment. But it is exceedingly technical. In the interest of clarity, it seems to me that the Senator from Kentucky would be rendering great assistance to the Senate if he were to agree to the request which I made awhile ago so that we would be in position to propose amendments to the committee amendment and to the joint resolution in an intelligent sort of way, and proceed in an intelligent manner instead of by a piecemeal system which we have been forced into by the parliamentary situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry that apparently the Senator has taken umbrage at the fact that I am unable to agree to his request. His request is a very unusual one, notwithstanding that the pending joint resolution is somewhat different from an ordinary bill. All the amendments which Senators desire to offer to the committee amendment now pending may be offered before it is disposed of. When it is disposed of, whether the amendments shall have been adopted or rejected, amendments may be offered to section 1, or in the form of new sections dealing with the merits and the substance of the agreement itself. Of course, I am opposed to any amendment, and will oppose as vigorously as I can any amendment to the substance of the agreement, because such an amendment would be tantamount to throwing the entire agreement out the window and requir-

ing renegotiation of the agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom, which, in turn, would, in all probability, throw the entire matter over into another year and into another Congress. I am not willing, so far as I can prevent it, to allow that to be done. I assume that if the Senate were to reduce the amount called for in section 2 to \$1,500,000,000, it would agree to an amendment reducing the amendment in the agreement itself to \$1,500,000,000, unless the Senate should take the notion that it wanted only \$1,500,000,000 of the money to be spent as the result of a bond sale, and the remainder in cash.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to propound to the able Senator from Kentucky this question: Suppose the the amendment which I just submitted were agreed to, and yet the amendment which I will offer tomorrow, or at some future date, were defeated, we would then be in the situation that the agreement between the two nations would cover \$3,750,000,000, and section 2 would cover only \$1,500,000,000. On the other hand, suppose my amendment, which is now before the Senate, should be rejected and yet the amendment which I will offer at a later time with reference to the sum of \$1,500,000,000 should be agreed to, would we not be placed in an awkward position unless we were to acquiesce in the request of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator must admit that what I have just stated could happen, although it may not.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is possible that the Senator's pending amendment could be carried if there were sufficient votes for it and his other amendment, to another section, could be defeated, in which event the agreement would stand, but the method by which the money would be raised would be different from that carried in section 2.

Mr. CAPEHART. And vice versa, if the new section I propose to add should be added, and the amendment I have offered today should be defeated.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would not only be vice versa, but very much vice versa, in my judgment. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not wish to indulge in further discussion of the matter. In view of the fact that I did hold out to the Committee on Banking and Currency and to other Senators the fact that it was unlikely there would be a vote today, I do not feel like pressing for a vote on the amendment now. Therefore I am perfectly willing, unless some other Senator desires to address the Senate, to have the consideration of the joint resolution suspended until tomorrow.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I see no reason why we should delay. I think what we need is speed. If England needs this \$3,750,000,000 let us act on the joint resolution, and give it to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. The expression by the Senator from Indiana of a desire that they get the loan today is a demonstration of a beautiful spirit on his part. Notwithstanding the fact that he desires to reduce the amount below what they need, he wants them to get today what little dab they are to receive, and not

have to wait until tomorrow. That is a beautiful spirit on the part of the Senator from Indiana, and I appreciate it. But notwithstanding the persuasiveness of his suggestion, in view of the expectation I held out to Senators that there would not be a vote today. I still insist that we shall not vote today on the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I cannot agree.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not take an agreement from the Senator from Indiana. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and after the quorum is obtained I shall move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and during the calling of the roll, the following occurred:

Mr. WHEERRY. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the distinguished majority leader, I suggest that the order for the calling of a quorum be vacated, and that we proceed with the business of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I couple with that a unanimous-consent request that if the order for a roll call shall be vacated, the Senate shall recess until tomorrow. We have agreed to take up the conference report on the aviation bill at 12 o'clock tomorrow as a special order. I do not know how long that will require, probably an hour, perhaps longer. The British loan joint resolution is the unfinished business, and will automatically be resumed after the conference report is acted on. If it is understood that the Senate will recess until tomorrow, I am perfectly willing to have the quorum call vacated.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before a recess is taken may I have an opportunity to report from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs the nomination of William H. Hastie to be Governor of the Virgin Islands?

Mr. ELLENDER. I object to the report being made now, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the quorum call is vacated, the Senate will revert to the business being considered at the time the absence of a quorum was suggested, and if any Senator desires to make a report; he can do so. I have no objection to vacation of the order for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for a call of the roll is vacated.

Mr. CAPEHART. A parliamentary inquiry. What will be the order of business tomorrow when the Senate convenes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a special order for 12 o'clock tomorrow, the conference report on the airport bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. What will be the next order of business?

Mr. BARKLEY. The next order will be the unfinished business, the British loan joint resolution, which will come up automatically as soon as the conference report is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a correct statement of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then the first business will be the vote on my amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's amendment is the pending question. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and if no Senator desires to discuss the amendment, it will be voted upon. But it will still be subject to debate if any Senator desires to discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that that is a correct statement of the parliamentary situation.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

William H. Hastie, of the District of Columbia, to be Governor of the Virgin Islands, vice Charles Harwood.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herschel V. Johnson to be Deputy Representative of the United States of America, with the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, in the Security Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified at once.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George V. Allen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be forthwith notified. That completes the Executive Calendar.

GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONVENTION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive C, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and Canada for the development, protection, and conservation of the fisheries of the Great Lakes, signed at Washington April 2, 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and it will be published in the RECORD.

The convention, with accompanying papers, is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a convention between the United States of America and Canada for the development, protection, and conservation of the fisheries of the Great Lakes, signed at Washington April 2, 1946. The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Interior.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate a report made to me by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention and a copy of the report of the International Board of Inquiry for the Great Lakes Fisheries.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 22, 1946.

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State; 2. Great Lakes Fisheries Convention; 3. Report of the International Board of Inquiry for the Great Lakes Fisheries.]

APRIL 19, 1946.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a convention between the United States of America and Canada relating to the fisheries of the Great Lakes and their connecting waters, signed at Washington April 2, 1946.

The convention has been negotiated with the objective of providing for the development, protection, and conservation of the fisheries of the Great Lakes through cooperation between the joint action by the governmental agencies of the United States and Canada concerned with the administration of these fisheries.

As a means for achieving this objective, the convention provides for the establishment of an International Commission for the Great Lakes Fisheries. The establishment of the Commission will provide an effective solution to the need for coordinated action by the various governments having responsibilities relating to the fisheries of the Great Lakes. At the present time, 11 governments have responsibilities relating to those fisheries—the Governments of the United States of America and Canada, the governments of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and the government of the Province of Ontario—and there are in existence no effective means for coordinating their efforts to discharge these responsibilities.

For many years the Governments of the United States of America and Canada, of the eight States of the United States bordering on the Great Lakes, and of the Province of Ontario, as well as the fishermen of the area, have been concerned over the decline in abundance of fish in the Great Lakes, particularly the more desirable species. Cooperation of the various governments concerned has long been urged as indispensable to effective and orderly development of the fisheries, not only in promoting adequate research into the causes of the decline in the fisheries but also in assuring that progressive and constructive regulations founded on scientific research and instituted by one jurisdiction may not be nullified by failure of an adjacent jurisdiction to adopt similar or complementary measures.

The need for cooperative action in order to preserve and develop the fisheries of the Great Lakes was recognized as early as 1875 when a report of the State of Michigan urged the necessity for uniform laws. During the succeeding 71 years a number of interstate and international conferences have been held with a view to obtaining coordination, but

in each case the efforts failed to achieve the desired cooperative action. However, persons interested in the Great Lakes continued to urge the need for effective cooperative measures for the benefit of the fisheries, and the matter has received the continuing consideration of the several governments concerned.

In 1938 the Council of State Governments called meetings of 60 State, Federal, and Provincial officials to study the problem. These meetings resulted in a recommendation that an international board of inquiry be established to consider and recommend measures for the conservation of the Great Lakes fisheries.

The Governments of the United States of America and Canada, under an agreement signed February 29, 1940, established the International Board of Inquiry for the Great Lakes Fisheries to study the taking of fish in the Great Lakes, to make a report of its investigations to the two Governments, and to make recommendations as to methods for preserving and developing the fisheries of the Great Lakes. During the course of its investigations, the Board of Inquiry compiled and analyzed data on the take of fish, studied the fluctuations in the fisheries, and examined into the possible causes for the variations in quantities and species of fish taken. In addition, the views of public officials, commercial fishermen, and sportsmen were solicited with respect to fluctuations in the abundance of the various species of fish and the causes of the fluctuations, with respect to the specific measures which should be taken by the Governments to improve the fishing, and with respect to the form of governmental organization which would be most effective in regulating and rebuilding the fisheries. In all, 29 public hearings were held throughout the Great Lakes region, in which some 1,500 public officials, commercial fishermen, and sportsmen participated. On August 6, 1942, the Board of Inquiry submitted its report to the Governments of the United States of America and Canada, calling attention to the need for an effective program for the conservation and development of the Great Lakes fisheries and recommending joint action for that purpose by the governments concerned. A copy of the report of the Board of Inquiry is transmitted herewith.

The Department of State, in collaboration with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, made a careful study of the report and recommendations of the board of inquiry. It was evident from consideration given the matter that measures with respect to the fisheries of the Great Lakes could be made effective only through coordinated action of all the governments concerned—Federal, State, and Provincial. At the invitation of the Department of State, representatives of the Governors of the eight Great Lakes States, including State conservation and legal officers, advised the Department at various stages in the development of the convention.

The provisions of the convention may be summarized as follows:

Article I defines the waters to which the convention applies.

Article II provides for the establishment of an international commission for the Great Lakes fisheries, to be composed of a United States section and a Canadian section, and for the appointment of an advisory committee for each lake consisting of representatives designated by each State or Province, as the case may be, having jurisdiction on the lake. The commission, the national sections, and the advisory committees are to be constituted in accordance with and governed by the provisions of the schedule annexed to the convention.

Article III provides that the commission shall formulate and recommend specific research programs of observations and studies of the Great Lakes fisheries to be carried out

by the appropriate agencies of the two Governments in collaboration with the States of the United States concerned and the Province of Ontario, as well as with other institutions and facilities.

Article IV requires that the commission undertake to develop a comprehensive plan for the effective management of the fishery resources of the Great Lakes for the purpose of securing the maximum use of those resources consistent with their perpetuation. This article provides also that the commission may make regulations fixing—

- (a) Open and closed seasons;
- (b) Open and closed waters;
- (c) The size limits for each species of fish;
- (d) The time, methods, and intensity of fishing;
- (e) The type and specifications of the nets, gear, and apparatus and appliances which may be used;
- (f) The methods of measurement;
- (g) The extent and nature of stocking operations;
- (h) The introduction of new species; and
- (i) Catch returns and other statistical records as may be necessary to give effect to the purposes of this convention.

Pursuant to the provisions of article IV, the United States section alone, i. e., the American members of the commission, will act in matters relating to Lake Michigan. Regulations affecting fishing in United States waters will not become effective until approved by the President of the United States, and regulations affecting fishing in Canadian waters will not become effective until approved by the Governor General in council. Paragraph 10 of the schedule annexed to the convention provides that regulations made and approved under article IV shall not become effective until 1 year from the date when the convention comes into force.

Article V requires that the Governments of the United States of America and Canada provide for the enforcement of the regulations in their own respective waters. It is provided, however, that in United States waters the regulations for each lake may be enforced, in the first instance, by the States bordering thereon within their respective jurisdictions. With respect to Canadian waters, the regulations may be enforced in the first instance by the Province of Ontario. The commission is required to keep itself informed as to the effectiveness of enforcement and to report to the two Governments on unsatisfactory conditions of enforcement. Upon the receipt of complaints, the Federal Government concerned agrees to take appropriate action to insure proper enforcement.

Article VI provides that nothing in the convention shall be construed as preventing any of the governments concerned from making or enforcing such laws or regulations within their respective jurisdictions as will give further protection to the fisheries of the Great Lakes provided that such laws or regulations are not inconsistent with the provisions of the convention or with the regulations made and approved thereunder.

Article VII provides for the prohibition of the shipment, transport, purchase, sale, import, or export of fish taken from the Great Lakes in violation of the regulations made and approved under the convention.

Article VIII provides that licenses to fish in the waters of the Great Lakes within the jurisdiction of any State or Province may continue to be issued by such State or Province in accordance with its laws and subject to such fees as it may fix. If licensing is necessary to give effect to the regulations of the Commission, and if any State or Province fails to establish or maintain adequate licensing, the appropriate Federal Government may take necessary measures to provide such licensing, in addition to that of the State or Province, as is required.

Article IX contains provisions regarding the enactment and enforcement of such legis-

lation as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of the convention and the regulations made and approved thereunder, with appropriate penalties for violations.

Article X provides for the ratification of the convention, the exchange of ratifications, and the entry into force on the date of the exchange of ratifications. This article provides also for the continuance in force of the convention for a period of ten years and thereafter until one year from the day on which either of the High Contracting Parties shall give notice to the other High Contracting Party of an intention of terminating the convention.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES F. BYRNES.

[Enclosures: 1. Great Lakes Fisheries Convention; 2. Report of the International Board of Inquiry for the Great Lakes Fisheries.]

(Executive C, 79th Cong., 2d sess.)

GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONVENTION

The President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, in respect of Canada,

Recognizing that the fish of the Great Lakes and their connecting waters constitute an important source of food supply and a natural resource of great economic importance to the United States of America and Canada, that fishing operations and other factors in the waters within the jurisdiction of one country may adversely affect the supply in the waters within the jurisdiction of the other, that some species of fish in the Great Lakes have declined and that further declines are probable unless adequate provision is made for the development, protection, and conservation of the Great Lakes fisheries and for the maintenance of conditions which will permit the maximum yield, and that the conservation and effective management of these fisheries require cooperation between and joint action by the governmental agencies of both countries concerned with the administration of these fisheries,

Have resolved to conclude a convention for this purpose and have appointed as their respective plenipotentiaries,

The President of the United States of America:

Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, for Canada:

Lester Bowles Pearson, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary for Canada to the United States of America, and

Hedley Francis Gregory Bridges, Minister of Fisheries of Canada;

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

It is agreed that the provisions of this Convention shall apply to the following, herein referred to as the Great Lakes: Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, Lake St. Clair, Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, Lake Superior, the connecting waters, bays, and component parts of each of these lakes, and the St. Lawrence River from Lake Ontario to the forty-fifth parallel of latitude. For the purposes of this Convention the St. Lawrence River from Lake Ontario to the forty-fifth parallel of latitude shall be treated as a lake of the Great Lakes.

ARTICLE II

1. The High Contracting Parties agree to establish and maintain a joint commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, to be known as the International Commission for the Great Lakes Fisheries and to be composed of two National Sections, a United States Section and a Canadian Section.

2. Each High Contracting Party may also appoint an advisory committee for each lake consisting of representatives designated by each state or province, as the case may be, having jurisdiction on the lake.

3. The expenses of each Section and of each advisory committee shall be determined and paid by their respective governments: Provided that joint expenses incurred for administration or research or for other purposes shall be paid by the two High Contracting Parties in equal shares.

4. The Commission, the National Sections and the advisory committees shall be constituted in accordance with and shall be governed by the provisions of the Schedule annexed to this Convention.

ARTICLE III

1. The Commission shall formulate and recommend specific research programs, which may be undertaken by the appropriate agencies of the two governments in collaboration with the states of the United States of America concerned and the Province of Ontario, as well as such other institutions and facilities as the Commission deems advisable, for observations and studies of the Great Lakes fisheries, to guide it in exercising its functions provided for in Article IV of this Convention. Such programs may include the collection and analysis of statistical information to reveal the current conditions and trends of the fishery resources, studies and appraisal of methods for increasing the abundance of fish by artificial propagation and other means, and studies of any factors that may affect the fisheries of the Great Lakes, including silting and pollution. The Commission shall take such further steps as it considers practicable to coordinate and develop research which it may deem of value in connection with the Great Lakes fisheries.

2. The High Contracting Parties agree that, within one year from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this Convention, each of them will undertake such observations and studies, recommended by the Commission for joint or concurrent action, as they consider necessary for the effective guidance of the Commission in the exercise of its functions.

3. It is understood that nothing contained in this Convention or in the laws and regulations of the High Contracting Parties or of any state or of the Province of Ontario shall prohibit the Commission from conducting or authorizing fishing operations and biological experiments at any time for purposes of scientific investigation.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission shall undertake to develop a comprehensive plan for the effective management of the fishery resources of the Great Lakes for the purpose of securing the maximum use of these resources consistent with their perpetuation.

2. The Commission may make regulations fixing:

- (a) open and closed seasons;
- (b) open and closed waters;
- (c) the size limits for each species of fish;
- (d) the time, methods and intensity of fishing;
- (e) the type and specifications of the nets, gear, and apparatus and appliances which may be used;
- (f) the methods of measurement;
- (g) the extent and nature of stocking operations;
- (h) the introduction of new species and
- (i) catch returns and other statistical records as may be necessary to give effect to the purposes of this Convention.

Regulations made under this section shall be uniform for each lake or equivalent in their effectiveness in the waters of each country as determined by the Commission. The Commission may from time to time make such regulations for each lake separately and may establish zones within a lake and make

regulations for the various zones of that lake in accordance with differences in conditions. Regulations for a lake or for a zone within a lake shall be made with due regard to the necessary interdependence of such regulations with the regulations for other waters of the Great Lakes.

3. The Commission may make recommendations to the appropriate federal, state, provincial and local authorities regarding measures for dealing with such other factors affecting the Great Lakes fisheries, including silting and pollution, as are not included under section 2 of this Article.

4. The United States Section alone shall exercise all powers and functions of the Commission in matters relating to Lake Michigan having due regard to the necessary interdependence of regulations for that lake with those for the other lakes. The Commission shall likewise, with respect to the other lakes, have due regard to the regulations for and the conditions of Lake Michigan.

5. Regulations made by the Commission for United States waters, and by the United States Section for Lake Michigan, shall not become effective until approved by the President of the United States of America.

6. Regulations made by the Commission for Canadian waters shall not become effective until approved by the Governor General in Council.

ARTICLE V

1. The High Contracting Parties agree to provide for the enforcement, whether directly or through state and provincial governments or by both means, within their respective waters of the regulations made and approved under this Convention.

2. It is understood that in United States waters the regulations for each lake may be enforced in the first instance by the enforcement agencies of the states bordering thereon within their respective jurisdictions and in Canadian waters by the appropriate enforcement agencies in the Province of Ontario.

3. The Commission shall keep itself informed as to the effectiveness of enforcement, shall report to the High Contracting Parties with respect to any charges, allegations, or conditions of unsatisfactory enforcement of which it is aware, and may recommend to the High Contracting Parties measures for the improvement of enforcement. Except as to Lake Michigan, upon the complaint of either National Section with respect to enforcement in any area of the waters of the other country the government of that country will take appropriate action to enforce the regulations for that area and will continue such action so long as it deems necessary.

ARTICLE VI

Nothing in this Convention shall be construed as preventing either of the High Contracting Parties, subject to their respective constitutional arrangements, or any of the states of the United States of America bordering on the Great Lakes or the Province of Ontario from making or enforcing such laws or regulations within their respective jurisdictions as will give further protection to the fisheries of the Great Lakes and as are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Convention or with the regulations made and approved thereunder.

ARTICLE VII

The High Contracting Parties agree to provide, subject to their respective constitutional arrangements, for the prohibition of the shipment, transport, purchase, sale, import or export of fish taken from the Great Lakes in violation of the regulations made and approved under this Convention.

ARTICLE VIII

The High Contracting Parties agree that, subject to their respective constitutional ar-

rangements, licenses to fish in the waters of the Great Lakes within the jurisdiction of any state or province may continue to be issued by such state or province in accordance with its laws and subject to such fees as it may fix, if such licenses and licensing are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Convention or with the regulations made and approved thereunder. Where licensing of fishing activities is necessary to give effect to the regulations made and approved under this Convention, and any state or province fails to establish or maintain licensing adequate for the successful control or management of any such fishing activity, the High Contracting Party having jurisdiction will take such measures as may be necessary to provide the needed licensing in the area of its waters affected.

ARTICLE IX

The High Contracting Parties agree to provide for the enactment and enforcement of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of this Convention and the regulations made and approved thereunder, with appropriate penalties for violations.

ARTICLE X

The present Convention shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and in respect of Canada by His Majesty in accordance with the constitutional practice, and it shall come into force on the date of the exchange of ratifications, which shall take place at Ottawa. The Convention shall continue in force for a period of ten years and thereafter until one year from the day on which either of the High Contracting Parties shall give notice to the other High Contracting Party of an intention of terminating the Convention.

It witness whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention and have affixed their seals thereto.

Done in duplicate at Washington the second day of April, one thousand nine hundred forty-six.

For the United States of America:

[SEAL] DEAN ACHESON

For Canada:

[SEAL] LESTER B. PEARSON
[SEAL] H. FRANCIS G. BRIDGES

SCHEDULE

SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE COMMISSION, THE NATIONAL SECTIONS AND THE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

1. The United States Section shall be composed of three members, one a representative of the fishery agency of the Government of the United States of America, the second a person chosen by the President of the United States of America from a list of two or more persons named by the states having jurisdiction on the Great Lakes, and the third a person duly qualified to represent the public at large by reason of knowledge of the fisheries of the Great Lakes.

2. The Canadian Section shall be composed of three members, one a representative of the public services of Canada, the second a representative of the public services of the Province of Ontario, and the third a person duly qualified to represent the public at large by reason of knowledge of the fisheries of the Great Lakes.

3. (a) Each High Contracting Party may fix the terms of service of its members of the Commission and of the members of any advisory committees established by it pursuant to article II of the Convention.

(b) Each High Contracting Party may fix the composition of the membership of any such advisory committee established by it, in order to give adequate representation to state or provincial conservation and fishery

agencies, commercial fishermen, sports fishermen, and the public at large; but the members of such advisory committee shall be designated by the states or province having jurisdiction on the lake concerned.

4. (a) At the first meeting of the Commission and at every second subsequent annual meeting thereafter the members shall select from among themselves a Chairman and a Secretary both of whom shall hold office for two years. The Chairman shall be selected from one National Section and the Secretary from the other National Section. The offices of Chairman and Secretary shall alternate biennially between the National Sections.

(b) In the event that the Chairman or the Secretary is not present at a meeting of the Commission the other members may appoint one of their number to act in his stead. In case the Chairman or the Secretary ceases to be a member of the Commission, the Commission shall select from the members of the same National Section a new Chairman or Secretary to hold office for the unexpired term.

(c) The Commission shall adopt suitable by-laws or provisions for the conduct of its meetings and for the exercise of the functions and duties vested in it by the Convention and may employ necessary personnel for the discharge of its functions.

5. Each member of the Commission shall have one vote and the Commission shall determine for each lake other than Lake Michigan by majority vote of the entire Commission the fishing regulations and other decisions with respect to such lake. With respect to Lake Michigan, each member of the United States Section shall have one vote and decisions shall be by majority vote.

6. (a) Any advisory committee which, pursuant to Article II of the Convention, may be appointed by each Government for a particular lake, shall be invited to all non-executive meetings of the Commission or its respective National Sections at which matters concerning that lake are to be considered, and shall be given full opportunity to examine and to be heard on all proposed fishing regulations and other decisions relating to that lake.

(b) Regulations made by the Commission, or by the United States Section for Lake Michigan, shall be submitted forthwith to any pertinent advisory committee or committees and shall not be submitted to the President of the United States of America or to the Governor General of Canada for approval until after forty-five days from the day on which they were made, unless all the pertinent advisory committees express their consent to the regulations prior to such time. The advisory committee or committees shall consider such regulations and shall comment thereon to the Commission or to the United States Section for Lake Michigan. If prior to the expiration of the period of forty-five days the Commission shall be requested by any such advisory committee to reconsider such regulations or any portion thereof, the Commission or the United States Section for Lake Michigan shall undertake such reconsideration prior to submitting the regulations to the President of the United States of America or to the Governor General of Canada for approval.

(c) Emergency regulations and decisions may be made without opportunity for examination and recommendation by the pertinent advisory committee or committees. Such emergency regulations and decisions shall not be operative for more than one year and may not be renewed without full opportunity for examination and recommendation by the advisory committee or committees.

7. For the purpose of considering and making regulations regarding fishing in the Great Lakes, the Commission, or in the case of Lake Michigan the United States Section alone, shall meet at least twice a year and one of

these meetings shall be designated by the Chairman and Secretary as the annual meeting. The date and place of the annual meeting and of such other meetings as may be necessary at any time shall be agreed upon by the Chairman and the Secretary except that only the representative of the United States of America holding the office of the Chairman or the Secretary shall call meetings of the United States Section for Lake Michigan.

8. Prior to any meeting at which regulations for any of the Great Lakes are to be voted upon, a hearing or hearings shall be held by the Commission, or in the case of Lake Michigan by the United States Section, at a place or places near that lake, which shall be open to fishermen and other persons in either country interested in the problems of that lake: Provided that in the event of emergency circumstances meetings may be held without such hearings. Nothing herein shall be deemed to prevent either National Section from holding hearings within its own country at its discretion.

9. The Commission shall publish biennially, or more frequently as it judges desirable, reports of its activities and recommendations, as well as such publications as it may see fit of a scientific nature or other public information, and may also arrange to publish the results of the research of collaborating and associated agencies.

10. Regulations made and approved under Article IV of the Convention shall not become effective until one year from the date when the Convention comes into force.

11. For purposes of the application of the Convention and regulations made and approved thereunder, the Commission may determine the boundaries between the lakes, and between the waters specified in Article I of the Convention and waters flowing into or from such waters, and may also determine the lake or lakes of which the connecting waters or any part thereof shall be treated as forming a part.

12. The provisions of this Schedule may be revised and amended from time to time by the Commission: Provided that:

(a) any revision or amendment inconsistent with the provisions of this Schedule must be confirmed by an exchange of notes between the High Contracting Parties; and

(b) no revision or amendment inconsistent with the Convention, or which diminishes the extent or effectiveness of state or provincial participation and representation of state or provincial interests now provided under paragraphs 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8 of this Schedule, may be made by the Commission.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to express the hope that during the remainder of the consideration of the joint resolution now pending, and all other legislative proposals which may follow it, Senators will make every possible effort to attend the sessions of the Senate. I realize the inconvenience that will bring about in many cases, especially when committees are holding hearings, but the joint resolution now before the Senate is one of the most important pieces of legislation Congress will consider during the present session.

There is to follow it, I hope, the bill now on the calendar extending the Draft Act. There are other bills of importance which may be urged for consideration, and by the time they are disposed of I trust the Committee on Banking and Currency will have finished its hearings on the extension of the Stabilization Act,

and that we will have that bill on the floor for disposition at as early a date as possible.

To be perfectly frank, it is very discouraging to try to legislate on an important matter of the nature of that now pending with Senators not in the Chamber. The Easter season is over, Senators have made their Easter trips to wherever they wanted to go, and they are due back in Washington and back in the Senate, in my humble opinion, though I do not set myself up as a judge of attendance and of the whereabouts of Senators. Certainly, however, the pending proposal is important, all the measures to follow are important, and we cannot intelligently enact legislation without Senators who are interested in it or who are likely to vote upon it actually being within the Chamber, or within easy reach, if votes are to be had by voice vote, by standing vote, or by the yea-and-nays.

Therefore, Mr. President, I express the hope that, regardless of the inconvenience which may be the result to Senators, they make every possible effort to remain in the Senate Chamber while these measures are under consideration. I do not make this request, I do not urge this course, by reason of any pique, or for any reason other than that it will be in the interest of good legislation.

I hope Senators will take this admonition seriously, and will not embarrass the Senate by continuous and sometimes unanimous absence from the Chamber.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I noted the latter part of the statement by the majority leader respecting important legislation which is awaiting enactment. I should like to stake out a claim now for as early consideration as possible of the atomic energy bill which was unanimously reported to the Senate last week.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is one of the bills I had in mind when I said there was other legislation of importance waiting. I did not wish to exclude any bill by trying to mention all of them. I did mention the pending joint resolution and the draft bill, which must be enacted in some form before the 15th of May, and the measure for the extension of OPA, which, unless the law is extended, will expire on June 30. Those are bills that have a time limit upon them. I did mention them. But that was not intended to exclude other important legislation such as that referred to by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire if the important legislation includes the Case bill, the so-called labor bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. It includes the consideration of that bill. I believe a substitute for that bill has been reported and is now on the calendar. That is one of the bills we hope to be able to take up for consideration.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. I appreciate the very wise and timely observation made by our

leader respecting attendance, and I shall make every sacrifice to comply with his request. Tomorrow, after disposition of the conference report, which our leader has already arranged to have considered then, I should like to have permission to obtain the floor to speak on the pending measure, the British loan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to that. I am wondering though whether it is necessary now to ask unanimous consent to obtain the floor.

Mr. BILBO. I wanted to give notice because of what the Senator said with respect to pushing for more speedy action.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the rule, if the Senator rises and is recognized, he can ask for and obtain consent to speak. It is a little bit on the side of bad practice to ask unanimous consent on the day previous in order to obtain recognition before some other Senator. I will cooperate with the Senator, I will say, in every way I can to see that he will be given the opportunity to speak.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator seemed to be in such a pushing mood I was afraid I would be pushed out.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to push the Senator out. I am in a pushing mood, I will say.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, bearing on the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, I should like to observe at this time that I hope some method will be found in the not too distant future for the Senate to have the opportunity to act on the joint Senate-House committee report respecting the reorganization of the Congress, the report having been submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and Representative MONROE, of Oklahoma. I think the problem we have been faced with here is one of the results of too many committees of the Senate meeting during the period of time the Senate is in session, and perhaps a more practical result will be achieved if we can have that report acted upon in the near future.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sympathetic with the suggestion of the Senator from California. One of the parliamentary difficulties at the moment is that the report referred to was submitted by a joint committee of both Houses. There has been some discussion of the propriety of the adoption of a resolution permitting the Senate members of the joint committee to constitute a committee for the purpose of making report to the Senate of legislation on the subject. Otherwise, it must go to a standing committee and take its course in the standing committee. That parliamentary suggestion has not yet been carried out, though I am sure it is still in the minds of the members of the joint committee. But unless something like that is done, or a standing committee reports the recommendation of the joint committee, a parliamentary difficulty is presented even in getting the matter on the calendar for consideration of the Senate. I hope it will be worked out very promptly.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1152. An act to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1610. An act for the rehabilitation of the Philippines;

S. 1757. An act to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 with reference to veterans' preference, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5400. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 331. Joint resolution to authorize suitable participation by the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Princeton University.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 23, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by Senate April 22 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Maj. Clifton Coleman Carter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

Maj. Luther Gordon Causey, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 30, 1942.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

First Lt. Marion Hopkins May, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. Hobart Burnside Pillsbury, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. William Aldrich Davis, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1939.

First Lt. John Breed Deane, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Orville Kenneth Knight, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1945.

First Lt. George Franklin Leist, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. Warren Newcomb Wildrick, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1939.

TO CAVALRY

Second Lt. Gerald Dean Hall, Ordnance Department (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1944.

Second Lt. Chester Craig Sargent, Infantry, with rank from June 5, 1945.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Lt. Col. Charles Royal Lehner, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1940.

First Lt. Henry Frederick Grimm, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. Cecil Wray Page, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. Robert James Welsh, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1945.

TO INFANTRY

Second Lt. William Patrick Hunt, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 1, 1943.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Nathan Louis Krisberg, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1943.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major with rank from May 1, 1946

Capt. Robert Edward Lee Choate, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

To be majors with rank from May 2, 1946

Capt. Edwin Roland French, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. John Williams Persons, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. William Chamberlayne Bentley, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Sam Williamson Cheyney, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Max Harrelson Warren, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Edwin Lee Tucker, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Ralph Rhudy, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Isaac William Ott, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Edward Holmes Underhill, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Trenholm Jones Meyer, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. William Pryor Sloan, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. George Frost Kinzie, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Albert Boyd, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. James Wayne McCauley, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Edward Harrison Alexander, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Capt. Frank Alton Armstrong, Jr., Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Capt. William Albert Matheny, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Capt. John Patrick Kenny, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Reginald Franklin Conroy Vance, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. William Lecel Lee, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Capt. Haywood Shepherd Hansell, Jr., Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Capt. Paul Mueller Jacobs, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Dudley Durward Hale, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Herbert Leonard Grills, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Benjamin Scovill Kelsey, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Thomas Lee Mosley, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Raymond Lloyd Winn, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Leonard Franklin Harman, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Kingston Eric Tibbetts, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Richard Henry Lee, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Robert Wilson Stewart, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Lewis R. Parker, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. William Maurice Morgan, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Richard Irvine Dugan, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Edwin Minor Day, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Jack Weston Wood, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. James Herbert Wallace, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

Capt. William Warren Roe, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 13, 1946.

To be captain

First Lt. Wayne Peter Beardsley, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 3, 1946, subject to examination required by law.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Frank Marion Lee, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 16, 1946.

CHAPLAINS

To be lieutenant colonel

Chaplain (Maj.) James Hugh O'Neill, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from May 11, 1946, subject to examination required by law.

To be major

Chaplain (Capt.) William Lewis Cooper, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from May 14, 1946.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidate for appointment in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

Thomas A. Foster to be pharmacist, effective date of oath of office.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 22 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL

Herschel V. Johnson to be Deputy Representative of the United States of America, with the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, in the Security Council of the United Nations.

FOREIGN SERVICE

George V. Allen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, fountain of all life, source of all blessing, whose infinite mind dwells behind the shadows and in the shadows, and whose heart of love pulses beyond the stars, at this noontide altar of a nation's faith we seek Thy guidance and a sense of Thy nearness. As we face the cares of today and the burdens of tomorrow, we are bewildered by the perplexity and the confusion of the world. When appalling human needs make this a time for greatness, save us from the devices and the duplicity of cowardly compromise, as evil enticements lie in wait to silence our consciences. Deliver us from the sophistries of the cynical and the inclinations of our own hearts to self-deceit.

As our starry banner flutters nearer to the earth in grief for the translation of a great public servant, reminding us that in the midst of life we are in death; like him whose earthly labor is ended, may we do our work to the last in sincerity, tranquillity, and self-effacement. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DEATH OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from Hugo L. Black, senior Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1946.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am directed by the Supreme Court of the United States to notify the Senate through you that the Chief Justice of the United States died in this city at 6:45 p. m. yesterday.

I have the honor to be,
Yours very respectfully,

HUGO L. BLACK,
Senior Associate Justice.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 263), as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore to attend the funeral of the late Chief Justice and to take such other steps as may be necessary in regard to the funeral ceremonies.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the adoption of the resolution I wish to utter a few words of profound sorrow over the news which we have officially received from the Supreme Court and which we had already received from other sources concerning the death of Chief Justice Stone.

Mr. President, there are no words of which I am capable that could under the circumstances adequately portray either the high respect in which Chief Justice Stone was held or the profound grief which at this hour we, as well as all America, experience over his unfortunate death.

There have been, Mr. President, great men who have sat on the highest Court of this great Nation. Some of them have

not always been Chief Justices; some of them have been Associate Justices. It is not my purpose to assess the relative value of the services rendered by the Chief Justices of the United States or by the Associate Justices of the United States; but I believe I am well within the bounds of truth when I say that no Associate Justice or Chief Justice within my recollection held a more abiding place in the affections of the American people and in the affections of all those who knew him intimately and personally than did Chief Justice Stone.

In the providence of Almighty God human events take on a form of mystery. All through the years men who were regarded as being almost indispensable, men who could least be spared by their country and their associates, have passed on after long and lingering illnesses, or suddenly, as in the case of Chief Justice Stone. Somehow or other, God Almighty always provides that there shall be remaining men of distinction and ability to carry on and lead the forces of democracy and of righteousness in whatever office or profession or calling the departed ones may have served, but they always leave in the pathway which they have trod footprints that are ineffaceable and that cannot be marked out, footprints that are not made in the shifting sands of the seashore, but upon the firm solid rock of integrity, durable, perpetual, noble, and inspiring.

Such a man was Chief Justice Stone. A great lawyer in his chosen profession, a man of wide knowledge in various fields of human activity, a great judge, a great Chief Justice. But even though he possessed these great qualities we like to think of Chief Justice Stone as a great man and a great friend. He had the quality of kindling confidence among those who knew him. He had a warm and affable personality. He had a wide conception of the problems that face our country and our civilization and the day in which we live.

His contribution during the past 20 years to the interpretation of our institutions, and to their jurisdictional, legal, and legislative solidarity and perpetuity has been outstanding, and proclaimed him to be one of the greatest public servants within the generation in which we live.

I mourn the departure of the Chief Justice as a personal friend. I admired him greatly for his human qualities, for his judicial poise and temperament, for his human understanding, and for the confidence in our institutions which he inspired, not only from the bench but in the social and personal connections which we all enjoyed and have enjoyed for the past two decades.

Mr. President, I am sure I speak the sentiments of the Senate when I say his family and his friends have our deepest sympathy. May the richest blessings of God Almighty rest with them during the remainder of their days and make more hallowed as the years go by the sacred memory of his life.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I was deeply shocked to hear of the sudden death last night of Chief Justice Stone. As one who has had the privilege of knowing Harlan Fiske Stone for many